

WORD CONTROLLED HUMANS



by
John Harland

Author of

BRAVE NEW WORLD, A Different Projection

The processes that turn individual humans into monstrous group organisms is the significant aspect of history on which this book focuses. "Civil" and "religious" groups, growing into powers by destruction of individual souls and control of individual will, receive the same examination — with no glorified generalities glossing over the horror that sharp focus reveals.

Concerned primarily with the word conditioning that now dominates America and Europe, this work highlights the need to first remove the obstructions from our own eyes — before trying to correct the faults of others. The history and current practices in our own conditioning are examined from a new perspective. No issues are dodged. A surprising view of Christianity is controversial and cogent.

This is a book for those who want to be individuals. There is none of the usual summing up that "we, as a group" should take some vague corrective action. Instead, a clear possibility for individuals to take effective action is spelled out in precise detail.

Every intelligent person is already highly concerned with the problem presented — and there is no intelligent person who will not have his mind stretched, and be stimulated to a sharper perception, by this book's unusual perspective.

CONTENTS

THE FORK IN THE ROAD	9
HUMANS AND NATURE	10
INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS	11
HERE AND NOW	14
LANGUAGE FOR DISCUSSING THE HISTORY OF WORD CONTROL	15
A PEOPLE COMMITTED TO INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY	17
THE BIBLE	22
HISTORICAL FACTS AND METHODS	22
A TYPICAL WORD CONTROLLED GROUP	24
THE WAY OF THE SERPENT	31
BACKGROUND FOR JESUS	34
MORE BACKGROUND FOR JESUS	40
JESUS	41
THE GREEKS LOOK AT JESUS	47
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH MAKES A SERPENT OF JUDAEO-"CHRISTIANITY"	50
MOHAMMED	53
THE GERMANS	56
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH PROMOTES JUDAEO-"CHRISTIANITY"	63
THE FIRST BREAKING APART OF THE CHURCH SERPENT	68
A FURTHER BREAK FROM THE SERPENT	71
THE STRANGE PHENOMENON OF "MONEY-MAD" AMERICANS	74
THE AMERICAN DREAM	79
THE GERMAN REICH	82
THE WORLD PICTURE AFTER WORLD WAR I	86
THE SECOND WORLD WAR	91
THE PRESENT WORLD CONDITION	100
FIRST REMOVE THE OBSTRUCTION FROM OUR OWN EYES	102
IS THIS CONSPICUOUS TREATMENT POSSIBLE?..	103
INDIVIDUALS CAN ACT	104

Never, no never, did nature say one thing and wisdom another.

Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller

THE FORK IN THE ROAD

Words can be used to tell others what an individual perceives; they can also be used to override perception, condition or destroy thought, and control humans. When the first word trails were being made in the expanding growth of conscious ideas, there was a fork in the road of possibilities. The majority of humans turned off in a direction that has now been made into a broad highway. Nature's method of making individual perception a major factor affecting survival was the way rejected; acceptance of the individual by a word-conditioned group was made the dominant requirement affecting the individual's survival. As I see it, the fork we have taken can lead only to human extinction or biological regression; the other could have led to a further evolutionary advance. I want to contrast the two directions, recommend the other fork, and set forth a procedure for getting over to it.

This means contrasting the respect-for-nature direction of such peoples as Eskimos, American Indians, and early northern Europeans to the direction of more completely word controlled peoples — and such a contrast is not easy, because only the latter have valued words highly enough to make written histories. In these histories they have ignored dissenting individuals, and they have derogated peoples moving in a direction other than theirs as "uncivilized." Also they have made their own records of wars and "nations" appear as the whole of human history. Word conditioning now rides in seeming triumph over individual perception. The viewpoint of the non-word-controlled people has been discarded as being not worthy of attention.

Centuries ago that other viewpoint was stated effectively, but now the very words to talk about it have had their meanings destroyed. The facet of dominant current thought, with which I must take issue, is the assumption that human "progress" has followed a straight line course from lower animals, through "primitive" peoples, to "civilization." This assumption results in

the attitude that a return to savagery is the only possibility other than present practices.

I am not going to advocate a return to the "noble savage." I want to talk about two different directions. I recognize a prehistory fork in the road; and I recognize that all "civilized advantages" could have developed as fully if humans had been going in the other direction that was not taken. We cannot go back in history, but I want to point out the prehistory fork and recommend the other direction as an option that is still open to us.

Before going into full detail, I will give a quick, fictional picture of prehistory peoples moving in different directions, with their directions strongly affected by their degree of attention to the natural universe. The relative respect-for-nature shown by peoples on the two forks of the road will be accented by picturing one in a cold and one in a warm climate — and fictionalizing a greater difference between them than climate alone would probably warrant. The purpose of this brief initial picture is not to imply that climate should be viewed as the most critical factor, but only to provide a simplified framework for further discussion.

HUMANS AND NATURE

In cold climates survival was possible only if each individual related with understanding to the whole natural world. Conditions encouraged this understanding: The cold enforced times of isolation, times when a lone person was at the mercy of natural forces, and was thereby stimulated to think about how he or she related to the whole universe. Such isolated persons saw the big picture: They saw all living things as having a basic relation to each other, and they saw the living as having a basic relation to the non-living part of the universe — everything interrelated. Seeing themselves as parts of everything, they either thought, or seemed to remember, that in times long past, they had come from — that is, they had been born or evolved from — one whole. Huddled alone in some womb-like warmth amid cold, they seemed to remember their millions of years of past, to remember when the first life came to be, and even before. The memory of everything seemed to be within them.

Around the campfire — a sort of womb shared by a group — they told each other of these pre-birth memories or dreams. Since most of them had experiences of this kind, most understood and had respect for each other's dreams or inherited memories.

However bare survival made exacting demands, and life often depended on wise personal decisions combined with close personal

relations. Those who survived were those who chose which persons to avoid, and with which to risk their lives, on a basis of each person's relation to the entire universe of reality — as demonstrated in that individual's waking behavior. Personal perception was a highly significant factor in survival. Dreams were understood and respected but the survivors were those who gave priority to waking perception of observed reality.

INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS

In warm climates people easily obtained abundant natural food and needed little protection from the elements. These factors made for denser populations, and the denser population caused people to think less about their relation to the natural world and more about their relationships to people as a group. They were less sensitive to their solitary thoughts, to their dreams or inherited memories, and had less womb-like experiences that brought innate-knowledge-of-the-total-universe, derived from individual introspection, into comparison with verbal-knowledge, acquired from the group. Each did not feel the critical, moment by moment, direct link between himself or herself and the universe as a whole.

When those few who paid attention to their inherited memories, or had what they considered to be significant dreams, told others about such big dreams, they discovered that few had similar experiences. The universe-to-individual experience was crowded out by more blatant interpersonal relationships. Everyone was impressed by colorful personalities. So the few who placed high value on their solitary experiences talked of their inherited memories or dream experiences as communications coming from a personality — from the "spirit" of the whole universe. Doubtless the dreamers were influenced by the constant focus on personal relations to such an extent that the unique experiences actually did seem to come from somewhere outside themselves.

Those who had these unique experiences found that uniqueness, itself, gave the dreamers prestige in the eyes of others. Some of the unscrupulous added extra drama to their dreams in order to create a prestige-building awe of their privileged contact with a "spirit" others could not see. It worked.

Because living was easy, words describing a dramatic relationship to "spirits" of the universe became more important in establishing prestige than demonstrated ability in relation to the universe of objective reality. Good hunters, and others of much experience and ability, lost their places as leaders to those claiming to have special communion with spirits knowing more than ordinary

humans. The new type of leaders, who began to lead groups by words that created awe, I will call "priests."

These priests first transformed prestige into control by public spectacles where a word-stimulated group obeyed the purported commands of the priest's private dream-spirit and did such things as dropping someone, who they said had offended the awe-inspiring-spirit, down a fire-spewing volcano. If no volcano was handy, they made a spectacle of "offering the offender to the spirit" by dramatically burning him or her on a conspicuous rock structure, while a frightened but fascinated crowd looked on in awe. The "spirit" whose supposed "will" the priest told to the people to incite such action is commonly called a "god."

"God" is a difficult word to use because it has several meanings. As some people use it, it means the comprehensive creative intelligence of the universe. Others use it to mean a stone idol or something completely imaginary. Recognizing that the one word can mean many different things, I will try to make clear how I am using it each time as I go along. To avoid making implications not backed by clear statements, I will not selectively capitalize the word in accordance with some practices, except when quoting the writing of others.

Now to continue. Some, who were skeptical about the nature or existence of a super-powerful being that others called god, became envious of the ease with which the priests controlled great groups of credulous people; so they invented gods of their own. They, themselves, then became priests, or spokesmen, for their gods.

Soon there were many different groups of word controlled people, manipulated as groups by priests, who claimed to be speaking for different gods. Some made stone or metal images of these gods, some identified them with the sun, the moon, the stars, the mountains, the sea — all sorts of things. Some stayed with the original idea that their god was an invisible spirit that spoke to them in private or in dreams.

While all this was going on something highly significant was happening to the priests doing the controlling and also to the groups being controlled.

Each priest directed all his efforts toward controlling a group of people with words. Both the size of the group and the extent of his control over it was the measure of his power. He felt the group to be an instrument he could use; it was much more deadly than a single spear or sword; it was a multitude of word-controlled spears.

After awhile it seemed to be an extension of his own body.

The controlled people also got mixed up in the same way. All of the ones being manipulated began to think of the group as being an extension of themselves. Like the priest, they also felt a sort of intoxication by reason of being "part" of a group having more power than any one individual.

This word-created condition caused the value of individuals to appear drastically reduced. Only groups seemed to have value.

Groups competed with groups, not only in open conflict, but also by trying to demonstrate which had the most powerful god. The so-called offenders or "enemies" of a specific god often died in the night from mysterious causes. Skeptical observers began to recognize that, not only was some ordinary human telling the group the "will" of the group-god, some ordinary humans were doing the killing of enemies in the night to carry out the actions "willed" by their group-god. These sneaky night killings, designed to create awe, became highly suspect.

Some potential group leaders decided to bring killings for the "will" of their gods into the open; these I will call "kings." Kings, who were obviously ordinary humans, began to take control of already word-conditioned people by proclaiming, or getting the priest to proclaim, that they were chosen to do so by the "will" of the people's god. The standing orders, called "laws," given by these kings who were obviously ordinary humans, had the "authority" of the god because the word controlled people had accepted the idea that the king had been appointed by the group-god.

* * *

I suggest that we now pause and consider the question: What does "authority" as used above really mean? In the world of reality a parent controls a child, an adult may have power over another by reason of strength or strategic advantage, or a group may have power over an individual. The idea implied by "authority" triggers action in those who have been word-conditioned to set aside their own innate will and accept the word-control of someone in "authority." As I see it, "authority," implying the "right" of individuals or groups to control or exercise power over others, has no meaning in the world of reality. I want to identify it as being highly suspect by always enclosing it in quotation marks.

* * *

When orders were obeyed because coming from someone having "authority," mass warfare between groups of word controlled people became the standard practice. If there was no apparent reason for a war, a reason was invented; the system was dependent on it;

"authority" grew by the demonstration of "authority." Kings sent out armies that were already word-controlled to force word-control on others, and the leaders of such armies often became the kings of those defeated in battle. Since these kings did not claim to get their "authority" to rule directly from the group-god, but from the other king, the people soon became so accustomed to word-control that they readily accepted any designated "authority."

In most of the densely populated areas, the people not only came to accept such control, they came to expect it. They came to want it. They had become dependent on it. They could make no decisions nor do anything unless directed by an "authority."

Great masses of such people, who were almost completely deprived of individual will by generations of word control became a burden to their controllers. Kings, who were busy leading armies, then gave "authority" to make "laws" — some orders from the "authority" — to an assistant, or to a group of assistants. "Governments" — a complex of law-making and law-enforcing groups claiming "authority" that no longer needed to be traced back to a group-god — became entirely possible. The people had become accustomed to look to an "authority" to make decisions for them, and had come to accept any "authority" that was not challenged by some other "authority." "Authorities" competed with "authorities" for group control. Individuals were lost in the shuffle.

HERE AND NOW

Group power that has no respect for individuals, because individuals can be pushed around by word-controlled groups, has now pushed word-control on everyone in the world. Now competition for control of the groups is so intense that it allows no time for considering what to do with the group under control; getting the control has just become a game; the game is the dominant factor in human life. Even the remotest Eskimo has been made to submit to "laws" of groups he has never seen, and has been made dependent on group-produced-products for basic survival. Gradually most hold-outs accept the game as "the way things are," even though by doing this they lose their essential being in direct relation to the universe.

This essential being of an individual in direct relation to the universe I will call "soul." Some who submit to group control are well aware that by so doing they are giving up their souls. Others have become such total zombies — the walking dead, subject to control by a will outside themselves — that they are conscious of

nothing but the game that dominates all else on this fork of the road; they are no longer aware that anything "counts" if it is outside the human game. All have lost their souls as individuals.

Such excessive group dominance of individuals is now rapidly removing humans from the advance echelon of evolution. So that we can discuss this as a present day problem, the simplified picture needs to be filled in with some specific details.

LANGUAGE FOR DISCUSSING THE HISTORY OF WORD CONTROL

The Eskimos and American Indians have followed their original way of life recently enough to give well-known evidence that word control is not something they accepted voluntarily. They resisted it, but lacked full knowledge of what they were resisting. The early northern Europeans, however, had been close enough to groups fighting over gods and governments to have stories about word-control that warned against it. They viewed all groups-of-people-acting-as-a-unit as all equally unreasonable. All such groups seemed ridiculous to them. All these groups were looked upon as an offense against human intelligence, whether based on the "authority" of a stone image, a spirit god, a king, or a group of law makers.

Such groups are usually called "nation-states" or "bodies politic" in current language. The early northern Europeans, who had made the decision to retain their individual sovereignty, talked of them as monstrous organisms. Sometimes they called such a group a "giant" because the group acted like one single enormous person. Sometimes they called it a snake or serpent because the group organism moved in a sneaky fashion and was poisonous. Dragon was the common term for "body politic." Dragon was an unreal, animal-like idea-creation obviously invented for only one purpose — to designate the indescribable group-monster. When and where the dragon symbol was invented would be a wild conjecture.

Dragon, snake or serpent, as symbols for a group of word-controlled people acting as a single organism, were used throughout much of the world long before written words. One of the earliest stories recorded in picture language — in Babylon before the Bible was written — tells of two lovers living happily in a nature garden, until a serpent tempted them away from their ideal existence.

This story was copied in the Bible and that version, where the natural place was called the Garden of Eden and the lovers were

called Adam and Eve, is widely known. However, the Bible version made a change in the original story that blinded readers to the meaning of the serpent: It presented Adam and Eve as the first and only people in the world. That kept anyone reading the Biblical version from recognizing that serpent was the symbol for a typical group of word-controlled people acting as if it were a single organism.

According to the Bible, Adam and Eve had two sons, Cain and Able. Cain killed Able and then went to the "east of Eden" and found himself a wife. This, of course, indicated that there had to be some other people in the world. But the inconsistency is unusually accepted without question by those who accept the Bible as interpreted by priests, or simply ignore such inconsistencies as requiring religious or scholarly research that they have no inclination to make.

I have gone into this detail about a specific Biblical story because I am going to make extensive reference to the Bible in the course of this work. That statement will doubtless alert some to appraise what I say from their scholarly perspective, while others will tend to react by turning down their level of attention, as they do at the approach of tense-eyed, door-bell-ringers gripping a book and presenting a pamphlet. Out of respect for diverse readers I now feel obligated to state "where I'm coming from." I am on the other fork in the road.

My perspective for looking at present day humans and my own approach to the Bible does not fit any pigeon hole that is familiar to me and, therefore, cannot be briefly stated. I think of it as being fairly close to the perspective that Eskimos, American Indians, and northern Europeans might have had twenty-five hundred years ago — before they were "civilized."

I intend mixing what I have to say about the Bible with some things I want to say about the early northern Europeans, who were my ancestors and doubtless the ancestors of many of my readers. So, before approaching the Bible, and approaching that event so significant that our calendar dates from it, the event of Jesus, I am going to tell "where I'm coming from" by presenting my view of the northern European thought pattern as it was about five centuries before Christ.

A PEOPLE COMMITTED TO INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY

Very little is actually known about the early northern Europeans. For over a thousand years, deliberate efforts were made to erase

their thought patterns and way of life from all memory. The American Indians and Eskimos, as they were before they were "civilized," seem to be fairly close to the picture most people have of the "pre-civilized" northern Europeans. However, the dating of artifacts by radio carbon combined with growth rings of bristlecone pines indicates that our European ancestors had full knowledge of what was called "civilization," perhaps even earlier than the Egyptians and others who left written words. What is known of their word stories indicates that they did not deal with "civilization" as a conglomerate; they dealt with the groupism problem.

The extant fragments of these stories, once considered highly significant, indicate that, unlike the Indians and Eskimos, the northern Europeans were well aware of the group-control practices of other peoples — and had consciously rejected them in favor of individual sovereignty. All the mutilated fragments told about the importance of keeping away from a dragon, or destroying any dragon that encroached on them.

The preserved comments about the early northern Europeans by outsiders who were not deliberately trying to twist the record — because they wanted to denounce individual sovereignty — are very scant. Julius Caesar, who wrote within the first century B.C., and Tacitus, who wrote within the first century A.D., give most of the first-hand information now available.

Caesar was a leader of armies and made the kind of report that interested people engaged in mass warfare. He told about the attitude of the northern Europeans toward the usual group-gods and about the effectiveness of their military organization. He said that the people of northern Europe, who had been least influenced by the rest of the world, respected only visible objects with obviously beneficial effects, such as the sun, the moon, the fire, et cetera. Caesar, himself, thought of such things as "gods" and implied that the northern Europeans so considered them when he said that the most isolated people, who he called Germans, "had not even heard of any other gods." However he also said, "they have no druids (priests) to lead them in matters of religion."

Putting together the writings of Caesar and Tacitus, we get this picture of the people's behavior: They consciously rejected the idea of "owning" land and consciously rejected the use of money. They had strong morals about when and how to fight but had no tight "group-power" control of individuals. Although custom considered some behavior honorable and other behavior dishonorable, individuals were free to fight and even kill on their own decisions.

They mated and reared children with the same individual freedom. Men and women had high respect for each other, considered individual faithfulness to a mate extremely important, and considered it highly undesirable to have sexual relations before fully matured — Caesar says at least twenty years old for the men.

As a paleontologist tries to make a picture of a prehistoric animal from bone fragments, I take available information and try to make a picture of a once living people and of their thought patterns from the fragments. That picture is of a people close to the realities of nature, where each was free to form his own religion.

Because the thought pattern, or religion, that was most common among these people was mutilated, so that it could be discarded as barbaric, there is nothing in clear word histories about their deepest thoughts. But similarities of language indicate that some of them had been intermixed with the people of India, Greece, Persia, and Italy many centuries before Christ. There are fairly good records of the religions in these places, particularly India and Greece, after other religions had been mixed with the same religion that continued in the original form among the early northern Europeans. From observing what factors are common, and what are different, in these religions, the consciously chosen direction of the pre-history northern Europeans can be guessed at pretty accurately. However detailed documentation for such guesses would add nothing to the living picture I want to draw. I want to emphasize the sharp contrast between the kind of people who think and act for themselves and word controlled groups acting as if the group, not the individuals within the group, should be viewed as the significant unit. Religion sets direction.

Lacking dependable "historical facts" to back up my own guesses about the basic religion of the early northern Europeans, I am going to quote from Melvin Gorham's *The Ring Cycle*, which is a creative interpretation of Richard Wagner's *Ring* operas. Both Wagner and Gorham were writing fictional works based on fragments of mythology. This picture is intended to indicate the intellectual or religious direction of a people who have chosen individualism.

In currently understandable form, Gorham is retelling the story dealing with what I see as the most significant problem facing the human species: Individuals relating to the natural world versus individuals relating to a group semi-organism, or serpent. Enough fragmentary records exist to show that many others have considered this to be the most significant human problem. The basic story was already a classic before the Bible was written. I previously

mentioned the Babylonian version. In the version now presented, the names Brunnhilde and Siegfried are given to the woman and man threatened by the serpent, or dragon. I see this version as describing the thoughts and attitudes of the pre-history northern Europeans. It has the added advantage that — being set in the twenty-first century — it needs no modification to make it understandable in current thought patterns.

Gorham says that Brunnhilde has this view of the universe and world:

When the creative intelligence was one, and the whole universe that was its thoughts had continued as a great galaxy of swirling stars for countless aeons, then the intelligence sought a new perspective for enjoying its past creations.

Selecting an almost infinitesimally small speck on a long forgotten planet, circling a minor star, the aboriginal intelligence chose to look at the whole from this utterly small perspective. Leaving all past creations to continue as inertia, it identified with the speck and formed it into a cell wall, wherein the continuing will of all intelligence moved as life.

The new living cell divided its self into two cells and found joy in the communion between life and life. Dividing into a greater number of cells increased the joy of the new creative venture even more.

These cells absorbed the warmth from the star that was their sun; they drank the dew; they breathed the air; they swam in the liquid; they touched, felt, and explored the solids; they selected bits of the universe, and brought these bits into the new small spheres which were their living beings. They communicated with each other and perceived with joy their diversities as an adventure in infinite possibilities.

After describing the development of multicellular organisms, the story goes on to talk about sex, the two lovers, and the serpent:

SEX

Countless aeons of experiencing these organic thought-realities, caused the creative intelligence within some organisms to perceive that life afforded two forms of joy: One came from creation by destroying and reworking what existed. The other joy was in perception of what already existed while cherishing its continued existence.

Wanting to maintain balance between these two forms of joy, the creative intelligence within some cell-organisms evolved into two different sexes — one for the directional emphasis of each form of joy. One sex emphasized continuity of the existing; the other sex emphasized destruction of the existing in favor of a new creation; the union of the two became a condition necessary to any living creation of both.

Because the individual of one sex did not absorb an individual of the other, as happens in asexual enjoyment of other asexual life, a built-in limitation was needed. Death, as a corollary to birth, was therefore designed into all sexual entities as an essential condition of sexuality.

Sex-feeling for another living organism evolved into such full perception of the other as an entity outside oneself — that it sometimes became love. The sexually-stimulated perception of an entity other than self also sometimes created love's corollary — a will to destroy when absorption was not the motivating impulse. Both were of equal value to the creative intelligence as a totality.

BRUNNHILDE

Distilled to its utmost purity by her mother, the essence of this perspective was passed on to Brunnhilde. In her own individual joy-oriented thought world, unaffected by other influences, she had spent her entire life in exile. Her physical world was the once-ideally-designed-but-now-gone-wild garden surrounding the ruin of the old castle. Into this Gottingarten — into her world of thought and her world of physical reality she now brought Siegfried.

Never could two lovers have found themselves in a paradise more suited to their love's total fulfillment.

BRUNNHILDE AND SIEGFRIED

Brunnhilde showed Siegfried the warehouse of food long ago provided for a whole army under siege — mountains of food packed in preserving containers and sufficient to feed a few individuals for many life times. She showed him all the old fruit trees that her mother had brought back to bountiful production and she, herself, had come to care for as for dear friends. She showed him the garden of all other good things she had learned to grow. She showed him her favorite lookout cliffs and secluded coves. Also she showed him all her favorite places for looking

out upon the vast unpopulated world surrounding her mountain home from the various rooms and terraces of the old castle.

She enjoyed showing and he enjoyed seeing the world in which she had spent her life. But their greatest joy was in each other, as made eternally diverse by their relation to the physical realities she had known in their most elemental simplicity. They lay with the warm earth pressing against their backs, felt the warm sun flow down upon them, watched while clouds changed patterns against the blue infinity of sky, breathed the fragrance of growing things, and listened to the myriad sounds of insects, birds, and animals that were undomesticated but unafraid. They made ripples in still waters with their toes. They laughed and yelled their joy under the great force of roaring falls and the deafening sound of water falling over rocks and over themselves. They ran and climbed and jumped, and found delight in the agility and movements of each others bodies. They enjoyed pushing their climbs to utter exhaustion, so that they panted hungrily for air and breathed in great gasps. They delighted in times of great thirst and the satisfaction of then drinking cooling water; they delighted in famishing hunger and the deliciousness of food. They relished the warmth and cozy communion of a campfire and were happy with the cold nights that added to its joy. They smiled happily, lifted their faces and opened their mouths to the sweetness of warm summer rain; they laughed defiantly into the drenching heavy rain blown by fierce gusts of wind mixed with driving hail. They enjoyed watching a storm through the castle windows when they were dry, cozy and warm. The whole of their physical reality was an unblemished delight.

THE SERPENT OR DRAGON

Only those things which they carried within them and brought forth through words were discordant, puzzling, and could not be accepted as realities always giving joy.

Siegfried had not sought the Ring but it was his because he had destroyed FAFNER. Now he remembered that the eyes of the whole world were focused on him and by reason of this the serpent crept into paradise. He had been bathed in words, in the very blood of the dragon, had felt their searing sting and developed almost full protection from the word-perpetuated dragon-madness. But, because of his contact with the Ring, the rumor of a kingdom with a word-transmitted philosophy of world brotherhood now tempted him to leave the paradise-like garden.

THE BIBLE

The Bible is the most widely distributed book in existence and has had an enormous influence on the entire world for two thousand years. Most versions are divided into two parts, known as the "Old Testament," which is primarily the history of people who call themselves Jews, and the "New Testament," which is primarily the story of Jesus. The Old Testament was probably written between the years 1200 BC and 100 BC; the new Testament between 50 AD and 120 AD, and revised about 300 AD. AH parts have been repeatedly modified and very few fragments of the actual early writings still exist.

There is no doubt that Jesus actually lived. The most reliable records say that he was born about 5 years before the calendar supposed to count from his birth is actually counted. He was crucified about 30 AD.

There are more people in the world who call themselves Christians — followers of Christ's teachings — than those organized into any other religion. But the Christians are divided into more than 500 different groups depending on what they think the Bible says and means. There are about fifteen million people scattered over the world who call themselves Jews. However many of them do not believe that the Jewish god, Jahweh, actually exists or ever did exist, and they all differ strongly with the Christians about what the Bible is really saying, and what the symbols in it mean.

Since the Bible is available everywhere in printed words, all this difference of opinion among people professing these various religions indicates that it is hardly more possible to tell the "factual history" of those whose history has been put into words than it is to tell about those who have no written history.

HISTORICAL FACTS AND METHODS

It is my opinion that reality cannot be captured in words — neither my words nor the words of anyone else. With such a view I need to explain exactly what I am writing and why. My focus is on the methods used by word controlled groups to destroy most individuals who resist and my primary use of "facts" is to illustrate such methods. The illustrations could be totally fictitious and still serve the purpose. However history is a convenient crutch to the imagination, and there is also a bonus to be gained from injecting a few fragments accepted as "factual" history. Accepted reference points can serve as a common language when we turn to the specific real problem that faces the human species here and now.

I want to show that the direction of the serpent, or body politic, which only exists in the minds of word controlled groups — but causes them to act as if were real — opposes (1) the direction pointed out by Jesus, and also opposes (2) the direction set by three billion years of life before humans came on the scene. Respect for the total universe requires that we look with more understanding at non-human life than we usually do. Life has existed on earth for 3,000 million years, mammals for more than 65 million, humans for perhaps 3 million, and the word history of humans for about 1/100th of 1 million. Some think that human group-methods have made obsolete the ways that have been working successfully for 300,000 times as long as human history. Others disagree. I am one of those who disagrees that groupism should replace individualism.

I want to accent the difference between the direction of a people who are sovereign individuals and a people who are fully committed to a cohesive group, and are acting as if they were mere "parts" of a single organism. Fragmentary evidence indicates that the people of northern Europe, up to about 200 BC, had a fully conscious commitment to individual sovereignty. Heavily documented evidence, much of it in the Bible, shows that the Jews committed themselves to act as a cohesive group not later than about 1250 BC. Peoples are never fully homogeneous — that is, all individuals in a group do not think and act exactly alike — so prevailing tendencies will be accented to show the significant differences in direction.

The widening aura of influence coming from the opposing directions taken by the people of northern Europe and the Jews, what is commonly called "spread of culture," came into conflict on a world wide scale before the flesh and blood people actually came into contact with each other. The opposition of ideas and ways of life were brought to a sharp focus in the person of Jesus. The meeting of these two opposing directions, turning on the teachings of Jesus as a whirlwind turns on the "eye" of a storm, created an ideological maelstrom that now affects the human populations of the whole world.

Similar meetings and conflicts between the directions taken by individual sovereigns and those taken by word controlled groups are multitude. I have mentioned the Babylonian story of an individual man and woman whose paradise was upset by the serpent — serpent symbolizing a word controlled group, considered as a type. As long as there have been such groups that story has been repeated with various symbols, both on an individual basis and on a group basis. Individuals have been forcefully pushed out of their small, personal natural parades by word controlled groups; and

individual-respecting groups — of substantial size — have been destroyed or absorbed by word controlled groups no more powerful than themselves. The use of words to trigger group force is the focus of my attention. Here, I am trying to retell the same story that is older than the Bible — retell it on a world wide scale that will lead up to the present day problem of present day humans. Instead of considering a single man and woman confronting a talking serpent, I will consider a whole people and their contact with serpents or dragons. Making a story of such magnitude sharply reveal its basic elements requires focusing on historical details only when they significantly affect the world here and now.

A TYPICAL WORD CONTROLLED GROUP

Serpent or dragon, as an image for a group of word-controlled-people-acting-as-a-single-organism, was widely used even before any word histories now available but not always did the image carry an unfavorable connotation. Only the northern Europeans seem to have had a conscious commitment never to create such a semi-organism among themselves — and to destroy any that tried to encroach on them. Most people thought only of opposing an existing serpent, that seemed undesirable, with a newly created replacement that they hoped would be better. I use serpent here instead of the present terms "nation-state" or "body politic" because it is the language used in the Bible from which this description will be taken.

People who consciously practice word control write word histories and a portion of the "Old Testament" is one of these. The Biblical story of a people who called themselves Jews is fully detailed and well-known. It then does not have to be built up from fragments; we only need to focus on its basic factors. I use it as an example to show how people, who have known life only as a word controlled group, almost always recreate, of themselves, the same kind of serpent that they see as being undesirable when created by others.

Although the story is clear, well-known, and easily expressed in brief, simple language, I will occasionally use quotations so as to make it easy to verify that my interpretation and selective use of brief passages is in context.

The Jews are usually spoken of as having been slaves of the Egyptians but they were not slaves as the blacks were slaves in America — individuals under control of individuals. It was only as a group of people, whose group organization had been disrupted, that they were controlled by the Egyptians. The Egyptians were a

fully organized group — or, in the language of the time, the Egyptians formed a full fledged serpent. The Jews were their slaves only as a people accustomed to word control speak of themselves as slaves when they no longer have their own serpent. Individual Jews actually had individual slaves themselves. The Jews had been in Egypt over four hundred years and had become trusted supervisors in charge of all slave labor.

Moses, who was a Jew, had been raised among the Egyptian rulers. He killed an Egyptian and ran away because he thought the Egyptians would discover what he had done. Exodus 2:12. Apparently the Jews knew about it but had not informed on him because they considered him as one of their own. Ex. 2:14.

Moses seems to have done a lot of thinking about that fact in the years that followed. At the age of forty, he returned with a plan for getting the entire Jewish population to make themselves into a semi-organism that would be independent of the Egyptian serpent.

Moses had the temperament of a strategy planner; his brother, Aaron, who had remained in Egypt, was a glib talker; together they formed an effective beginning for building word control. Chapter 4, verse 16 of Exodus says of Aaron in relation to Moses: "he shall be thy spokesman unto the people; and he shall be ... to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shall be to him instead of a God."

The chief word controller of the Egyptians was called a Pharaoh and, at that time and place, the power of a group was spoken of as the power of the group's god. Inasmuch as the Jews had accepted Egyptian "authority" for over four hundred years, the Pharaoh had ceased to think of them as a separate power. He was in for a surprise.

Approaching the Pharaoh, Moses and Aaron asked that the Jews be allowed to go away into the wilderness to worship their god, which they said was different from that of the Egyptians. The Pharaoh not only denied the requested permission but, presumably considering the request to be a gross impertinence, he sought to discipline the Jews. He increased their work by requiring them to gather their own straw, used in making bricks, without reducing the quota of bricks required of them.

As might be expected, the Jews, themselves, then turned against Moses. However, since he was aware that they all knew he had killed an Egyptian and had not squealed, he placed high value on their feeling of group solidarity. It was a big factor in his strategic plans. He had been raised among the royalty; he had access to the Pharaoh; Aaron, the glib talker, already thought he was a god; the Jews had strong group feeling — so accomplishing his objective

was only a matter of putting the persuasive factors together in the most effective way.

The next confrontation between Moses, as a potential group leader, and the Pharaoh, as a leader already holding power, appears impressive even without giving it the magic-like interpretation which editions of the Bible written long after the event put on it. There is no need to assume that magic was involved. Full clarity regarding what was being said only requires recognition of the symbols for abstract ideas that were in use at the time.

Staff, or rod, as used by peaceful shepherds, was a symbol of peace. Serpent, of course, was the symbol for a group acting as a cohesive unit.

Obeying instructions from Moses, Aaron used his eloquence to convince the Pharaoh that the Jews were already a cohesive unit and, as such, were a power to be reckoned with. He recited the extent to which the Egyptians were dependent on them, then told the Pharaoh what the Jews, acting together, could do if he refused their demands.

The Pharaoh was sufficiently impressed to call in his advisors and ask them to lay before Moses and Aaron what countermoves the Egyptians would take — that is, the Pharaoh wanted the advisors to make Moses and Aaron understand how the Egyptians would retaliate if the Jews carried out their threats. This was a battle of words.

Even after the language of the time was reinterpreted by translators adding a touch of magic, it is easy to understand what happened. As related in the Bible, Aaron, the fast talker, always stayed one jump ahead of the Egyptians. Ex. 7:10-12 says: "Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and before his servants, and it became a serpent. Then Pharaoh also called the wise men and the sorcerers: now the magicians of Egypt, they also did in the same manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods."

Aaron apparently could out talk the advisors of the Pharaoh. But it was all talk. The Pharaoh was not impressed with the Jews as a power. However, this was only round one.

Moses, raised among Egyptian royalty, knew to what extent the Egyptians interpreted all unexplained happenings as the acts of gods. According to Ex. 7:1, Moses heard his own god speak to him saying, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." Aaron was already willing to act as if Moses were a god, and he was a man with a gift for words. Moses

was a shrewd and careful planner.

The second confrontation of Moses and Aaron with the Pharaoh presumably was well-timed to coincide with a red tide — caused by a marine worm of flagellate protozoa that turns the water red and kills the fish. Such a tide was approaching in the river. Moses and Aaron, making themselves conspicuous before the Pharaoh, stretched out their rods over the river as if they were magic wands. They told the Pharaoh, "The LORD God of the Hebrews hath sent me unto thee, saying, let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness; and, behold, hitherto thou wouldest not hear. ... I will smite with the rod that is in mine hand upon the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood. And the fish that are in the river shall die, and the river shall stink." Ex. 7:16-18.

It happened: The river became red, the fish died and the river did stink. However it did not fully persuade the Pharaoh that he needed to make any concessions to the Jews.

But apparently this second confrontation — that brought no disciplinary action against them — impressed the Jews that Moses had been pretty clever. They now apparently thought that he might be a leader who could get some advantages for them. They were ready to listen to him — maybe even cooperate a little — if they could do so without sticking their necks out.

That was all Moses needed. They were trusties in charge of all the other "slaves" of the Egyptians, running not only the brickworks but all the farming, cattle tending, household work, cooking, serving — everything.

After seven days, in which the Jews had time to make some preparations, Moses told the Pharaoh that if he refused to let the Jews go into the wilderness for a three day religious rite that frogs would overrun Egypt, would be in the beds, be in the bread troughs — everywhere.

It happened. The Pharaoh began to talk concessions. But as soon as the frogs were gone, he apparently thought the problem had been solved.

Looking at the whole story after it is all over, we can see that something significant was happening. Without showing their involvement openly, the Jews as a group were gradually becoming involved in cohesive action. A plague of lice, and then a plague of flies followed the plague of frogs at predicted times.

Then Moses raised the ante — and the Jews went along with the increased involvement. Moses made another prediction, and right on schedule, the cattle of the Egyptians died but not the cattle of the Jews.

Then, as predicted, an epidemic of boils spread about. There was also a hail storm and a swarm of locusts for which Moses took credit. He now had the Jews in such full involvement and so pleased with the way things were going that he could raise the ante still further. He had a big plan.

The Pharaoh had at last been impressed that the Jews were a cohesive group and as such constituted a group-power to be recognized. He accepted the original demands Moses had made and agreed that the Jews could all go out in the wilderness for three days and perform their religious ceremonies. But Moses apparently thought it better strategy to be more certain that all the Jews were behind him before he made his big move. Or maybe he just needed time to make preparations. In any event he delayed by making further demands. He insisted that they be allowed to take all their cattle with them.

That was too much. The Pharaoh refused further negotiations. He ordered Moses out of his sight, saying that if he ever saw him again he would be executed.

Moses, of course, could see that the time had come for an all-or-nothing move that would result in total involvement of the Jews or total failure. He felt confident. He could see that the non-Jewish servants, and the Egyptian people in general, had been impressed "and the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt." Ex. 11:3.

Chapters 11, 12 and 13 of Exodus tell the story of Moses' big move in this way:

"The LORD said unto Moses... Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbor, and every woman of her neighbor, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold. ... And the LORD gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians, so that they lent unto them such things as they required; and they spoiled the Egyptians."

As part of the same all-out plan Moses told the Jews, "Thus saith the LORD. About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt; and all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the firstborn of the maid-servant that is behind the mill and all the firstborn of beasts. And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more. But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast; ... In the tenth day of this month take every man ... a lamb into his house. ... And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole

assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening. And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts, and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it. ... And thus shall ye eat it: with your loin girded, your shoes on your feet, and staff in your hand; and ye shall eat it in haste: it is the LORD'S passover. For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast."

"And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and there was a great cry in Egypt; for there was not a house where there was not one dead. And he called for Moses and Aaron by night, and said, Rise up, and get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel; and go serve the LORD, as ye have said. Also take your flocks and your herds, as ye have said, and begone. ... And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot, that were men, beside children. And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and flocks, and herds, even very much cattle."

As usually happens in the word-control of a group, the revolution of the Jews against the existing serpent came first. They were just a cohesive group, not yet organized into a body politic, or, in the language of that day, they were not yet a serpent or dragon. But they had acted together and that was every individual's commitment to cohesiveness. The "Feast of the Passover" had been established and that would become the prototype of their future actions.

They got together and agreed on how they would put the reality into words. Exodus 13, verses 14-15, tells how they decided to tell the story: "And it shall be, when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What is this? that thou shalt say unto him, By strength of hand the LORD brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage. And it came to pass when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the LORD slew all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both the firstborn of man, and the firstborn of beast; therefore I sacrifice to the LORD all that openeth the matrix, being males; but all the firstborn of my children I redeem."

Their actions against the Egyptians and the way they were going to tell the story in the future would, of course, tend to bind them together. But, as is the usual case, they had been too involved in their revolution against what seemed undesirable in the word-control, or laws, already imposed on them to think about what would be a desirable way of life.

There is no indication that they ever considered the possible desirability of individual freedom. There seemed to be only the question of what kind of word-control they should adopt for themselves as purportedly coming from what kind of god.

They wanted a god that would bind the group into a unit. Quickly they made a golden calf, by pooling and melting up into one unit the jewels they had "borrowed" from the Egyptians, and called it the god that had brought them out of Egypt.

They did this while Moses went up on a mountain for forty days and came down with Ten Commandments on stone tablets, which he presented to them as coming from the god that had brought them out of Egypt. The Commandments also went in the direction of insuring group unity. The first five ordered the Jews to honor that invisible god that had brought them out of Egypt and to honor their parents. The next five were, thou shalt not: 6. Kill. 7. Commit adultery. 8. Steal. 9. Bear false witness against thy neighbor. 10 Covet anything that is thy neighbors.

The Commandments set forth no marriage laws to clarify what was meant by "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Neither did they set forth any property laws to clarify what was meant by "Thou shalt not steal" or "covet." Marriage and property laws vary widely throughout the world and do not exist at all where people have not been word conditioned. So a thoughtful person, reading the Bible, would, of course, wonder whether the Commandments referred to the laws of the Egyptians or some unspecified laws that the Jews might have known prior to their four hundred years under Egyptian law. In any case one might wonder what marriage and property laws they were being commanded not to break by not "committing adultery" and not taking or coveting their neighbor's "property" — that is, one might wonder what "civil" laws — made by what "government" — were being tacitly "approved" by the author of the Commandments.

None of the Commandments could have any meaning to anyone who was not already word conditioned except one: "Thou shalt not kill." And that one shows up glaringly. It becomes the most questionable of all. Moses immediately ordered them to violate it.

Some were willing to accept the laws on the stone tablets as coming from the god who had brought them out of Egypt. Others were not. The way Moses handled the situation illustrates the usual method of serpent makers.

According to Exodus 32:26-28, Moses said, "Who is on the LORD'S side? ... And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him. And he said unto them, Thus saith the LORD

God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor. And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses: and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men."

The next maneuver in molding the Jews into a group-acting-as-a-single-unit is not presented in language quite as clear to present day readers as the one just recited but, obviously, it is the same sort of action. The next one refers to the competition between serpent makers and the tendency of the controlled to want to do the controlling.

According to Numbers 21:5-6, "the people spake against God, and against Moses, Wherefore have ye brought us out of Egypt, to die in the wilderness? for there is no bread, neither is there any water; ... and the LORD sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died." Then Moses came up with his own serpent, held it up before the people, and those that looked on the serpent that Moses held up lived.

That is the way of every semi-organism of word controlled people as long as there has been a word history. They form serpents, dragons, nations, bodies politic — or whatever the word-controlling-semi-organism is called. Individual flesh and blood humans die if they will not commit themselves to be "parts" of the word-created serpent of those around them, or if they advocate something different from what is currently held up by the leader already having word control over the people.

THE WAY OF THE SERPENT

It is awkward not to have a single term running through all history for what is now called "nation-state" or "body politic." The ancient term dragon seems to have had more use on a worldwide basis than serpent. In China a picture of a dragon with four toes was a "common noun" for what is usually called serpent in the language of the Bible; a dragon with five toes was a "proper noun" for the ruling "body politic" of China. The "proper noun" Japanese dragon had three toes; the Persian dragon had a cloven hoof, et cetera. The Bible most often uses the word "serpent" instead of "dragon" but in Chapter 12 of Revelations both terms are used repeatedly and inter-changeably to designate the same thing that is currently called "body politic."

It is awkward not to have a single term to designate a word-controlling-semi-organism, but an even bigger problem is the varia-

tion in concept. The concept of the fictitious entity used in word control varies in time and place. That, of course, is the trouble with words that point to no perceivable reality. They have fuzzy or slippery meanings and cause much confusion. Reality is the language of the universal creative intelligence. When humans create words that do not refer to a perceivable reality, there is likely to be confusion between the man-conceived fictional entity and something clearly perceived which is real.

In America, the people from northern Europe were pushing out the native Indians and forming a body politic, or serpent, at the same time they were taking possession of raw land. Because land was their major interest at that time, they assumed that the essence of a body politic was simply the cooperative effort of individuals for the purpose of holding and defending peaceful possession of the land. Edward Everett Hale's *Man Without a Country* made its basic emotional appeal with a poem containing these words, "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, 'This is my own, my native land.' "

Slowly Americans are now awakening to the fact that a nation-state, body politic, or whatever the serpent is currently called is not simply "my own, my native land."

The history of the Jews gives a clear picture of the serpent — or body politic. Looking at their history, we can see that it is any fictional thing that word controlled individuals are conditioned to think of as a "whole" and conditioned to think of their individual beings as its "parts." Land had nothing to do with the formation of the Jewish serpent. Moses began to involve the Jews so that all must act as if they were parts of a single unit. Cohesive group action demonstrated that, as a potential serpent, the group was already an invisible power, and that those who were not its "parts" had reasons to fear it. As soon as the embryo serpent had been developed a little further, it became a power which even those individuals who were its "parts" had reason to fear. Group power exerted against individuals is the basis for establishing word control, but word-expressed ideas, that override clear thought, are the necessary implements to perpetuate it.

The idea-content of the word control exercised by serpent makers challenges the creative intelligence of the universe in determining good and evil. It denies the manifest morality of the natural world in which all natural development (progress, if such a word can have meaning) is made by mutant individuals demonstrating their mutant worth in relation to the total universe. The serpent makers advocate the pseudo-morality that individuals should subordinate

their individual reason and judgment to the "authority" of the group. The Jewish Bible provides the best example of the serpent for two reasons: One, it is widely distributed. Two, it clearly advocates the pseudo-morality of the serpent, and condemns individual-self-assertion as immoral. The Jews as a group never advocated a relationship of an individual to a god who cared anything about individuals. The only relationship they advocated was that of "a people" to a group-god that dealt with cohesive "peoples" or serpents.

Since a serpent is a fictitious entity, there is, of course, nothing in the world of reality that identifies any individual with a particular serpent. Spies or saboteurs, who are committed to one serpent, but who pretend to be "part" of an enemy serpent are recognized as common. When discovered they are usually killed. On the other hand, one who is committed to one serpent may be killed by those who are committed to the same serpent — because there is no real way that anyone can prove he is fully committed "part" of something that has no reality. Those having "authority" decide who are "parts."

An assumption that a serpent has reality because the land claimed in its name has reality is a common basis for confusion. Looking at Jewish history helps to clear up this confusion. During most of history the Jewish serpent has not been identified with any particular geographical area. As a result, those trying to clear up in their own minds just what is the nature of these semi-organisms, of which the Jewish serpent that has no geographical identity is one of the oldest, are likely to ask, "Are the Jews a separate race from other humans, or does their identity as Jews depend on their religion" }"

Clearly it is neither race nor religion that makes of them a cohesive group acting for peculiarly Jewish interests.

Biologists recognize seven fairly distinct "races" of early humans but the Jews are not a recognized race. Known records make it clear that those who called themselves Jews when they came out of Egypt have interbred with others to such an extent that their descendants cannot be identified by any physical characteristics.

And, as to their belief in the "god who led them out of the land of Egypt," many who call themselves Jews are either atheists or agnostics.

So they cannot be called Jews either because of race or because of religion. Jews are Jews because they voluntarily choose to identify with the Jewish serpent — even though at the same time they usually pretend to identify with some other one.

Most present day Jews claim to be "parts" of two separate " wholes." Jews who are "United States citizens" have a divided allegiance between the ancient Jewish serpent and the United States. Jews have practiced this same sort of dual identity — simultaneously claiming to be "parts" of two separate " wholes" — for thousands of years and continue to follow the practice even though it often results in their persecution. Obviously they continue to play this double game because their three thousand years of Jewish tradition shows them that the Jewish serpent has repeatedly eaten up other serpents. The Feast of the Passover keeps fresh the methods that were successful in Egypt. The Jews then choose to be part of the Jewish serpent and to use the methods celebrated in the Passover Feast in their relations to other serpents.

The unreality of the word-created-semi-organism can be most clearly seen by looking at those who, like the Jews, are purportedly "parts" or "citizens" of two such semi-organisms at the same time. On the other hand, the efficacy of word conditioning is shown by the persistence of the Nomadic Jewish Nation. The Nomadic Jewish Nation is given priority over all other nations in the actions of most Jews, even when many are agnostics or atheists, are biologically indistinguishable, and are committed to nothing but the pseudo-morality of groupism expressed simply as "we Jews" against all "non-Jews."

BACKGROUND FOR JESUS

The history of the Jews gives a concept-clarifying example of the history-old fictitious entities that have been called by various names and seen through varying concepts. It also provides another significant example. It provides a well-known example of what happens to individuals who choose not to be a "part" of a serpent to which those surrounding them are committed.

About the time that Jesus lived, there was a drop-out from Jewish traditions, called John the Baptist, who was doing a curious thing. He was baptising other Jews in the River Jordan. Since that time, baptism has been practiced by Christians to whom it signifies burial of the sinful-old-self and resurrection of the new-self-born-again-as-a-Christian. However, John the Baptist was performing this ceremony before the ministry of Jesus and was baptising Jews who were not accepting an openly declared new religion. This raises a question.

What did this baptism as practiced by John mean to the Jews? Ceremonial washing with water before a religious rite had long been a common practice and a symbolic washing away of sins is

suggested by the Bible. However the question of what "sins" were being washed away calls for an answer.

In our subconscious, we humans, have a memory of a great event _ the time when we left the water to become land animals. This is a memory of choosing segregation from our own kind. At the time of John's curious practice, even as now, legal and social conditions were exerting pressure against segregated groups, and there was a great deal of evidence that all Jews at that time would have done well to abandon the Jewish serpent. The individual Jew's semi-articulate public announcement that he was abandoning Jewish separateness from all humanity, imposed on him as a "part" of the Jewish serpent, appears to be the most probable conscious or subconscious meaning of this re-immersion in water from which all life came. To the fully understanding it could well have meant even more than an abandonment of the separateness from other humans; it could have meant abandonment of separateness from all forms of life, abandonment of separateness from the whole natural world. Whatever may have been the meaning of the act, John readily baptised some Jews but, according to Matthew 3:7-9, he said to others, "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father."

The "authorities" put him in prison, cut off his head and gave it to a dancing girl on a platter. But before that happened, Jesus came to him and John baptised Jesus.

Jesus is the focal point bringing together the people committed to individual sovereignty and those committed to being "parts" of a semi-organism that has its imaginary existence entirely in words. A background for talking about Jesus comes from considering the mixing of those diametrically opposite ideas as upheld by different peoples. On one side the ideas were coming from a people who were close to nature, and were focusing on their relationships with universal reality. On the other side the ideas were coming from people of dense populations, who were focusing on the relationships of group to group or, in Biblical language, on the relationships of serpent to serpent.

The cultural whirlpools, called "civilizations," caused by these mixings are recorded in extensive word histories. We will look briefly at one in India and one in Greece. From what is known of these two it is possible partially to confirm the previously presented thought pattern of the isolated early northern Europeans. We have already mentioned that our knowledge of such thought patterns

was, in part, extrapolated from the known religions of early Greece and India.

From the early religions of India we deduce the original perception of female and male characteristics as the northern Europeans saw those sexual characteristics. Because those pushing into India from the north found dense populations committed to group-gods, they tried to present their understanding of human female and male characteristics by fictionalizing them in a highly accented form as separate gods. They presented aboriginal creative intelligence as one god, called Brahma, who then became two. These were: Vishnu, the god who created by cherishing and nourishing what was selected, and Siva, the god who created by selective destruction. Presumably this fictional creation of gods was designed to isolate and look at observable human characteristics, even while making some concessions to the god-thought-patterns of the people who were native to India. The reasoning behind the method is easily understood.

However, something happened to those who went into India, and confronted great masses of people committed to group-gods, that is more difficult to understand. They not only lost their joy in living and came to look upon life as a burden, they rationalized the rejection of joy. The religion of India, as it eventually developed, actually presumed to believe that all life was a mistake and the mistake required correction. Apparently this loss of joy came about because those bringing northern European ideas were vastly outnumbered by the dense populations already in the area, and were never able to reach full understanding with groups committed to the worship of group-gods. Instead, the invaders withdrew into themselves, meditated about the problem, found no joy in such existence, and, having a comprehensible idea of how the universe was created, turned their thoughts toward a method by which each individual could be "uncreated." That is, they sought for a method of reversing the process of creation and returning to the oneness of the aboriginal creative intelligence. Their stated objective "Nirvana," means "blowing out, as of a candle."

The basic difference between them and the northern Europeans was not primarily a difference of how they perceived the universe but simply a difference of attitude — of saying "no" or saying "yes" to life. Within the framework of accepted customs the northern Europeans could actively assert their individual sovereignty with pride and courage. Individual sovereignty was something they all recognized as fully intended by the creative intelligence of the universe. Their conviction that morality unquestionably backed the

discrete self gave an emotional power to the individual will, which made "just living" into a greater joy than any serpent people could ever know. Although those who went into India never fully advocated serpent practices they lost their joy in "just living" when they accepted defeat.

In Greece, the northern Europeans pushed in upon the native population and found the same sort of people as had been found in India — those committed to the worship of group-gods. These natives had the same prehistory conditioning which caused them to think each individual was "part" of a group; they had a "morality" built on word fiction that advocated group cohesiveness. However the result of the invasion into Greece was different from the result in India. The invaders did not withdraw to meditate on strategy — and then fall into an extended meditation aimed at becoming uncreated. As centuries passed they did not drown in the flood of word-conditioned people. In Greece, the invaders gained dominance over the native population. From the beginning they attempted to modify the basic nature of the serpent or dragon, to which the native people had come to look for orders. The natives, brainwashed with words since long before the dawn of history, had been conditioned to think that individual sovereignty was immoral. When the northern invaders killed their word-controllers, and did not replace the dissolved word-serpents with new serpents, the native people simply became slaves looking for a master.

Instead of the sort of serpent or dragon that was known all over the world long before there was a written language, the Greeks tried to conceive a new sort of fictitious entity which they called a "state." The idea was for the "state" to get its synthesized "will" from pooling the will of those whose individual sovereignty was acknowledged. By recognizing that individual humans — not group-gods — made the laws, they sought to avoid a serpent's tyranny over its "parts." Hoping to avoid group-tyranny, they had open discussions as to what laws should be made.

In the course of endless discussions, they attempted to rationalize that what they were doing was "scientific" and "logical." The concept of the Greek "state" comes down through history as being "better" than other serpents. This, however, is a comparison between two things of which neither can be called good. Like the brainwashed natives, the Greeks also let words overrule their Perception. They began to use words as if words could create a reality — as if words could do more than point to what is real.

They forgot their original concept that, when organic life was

created, the extant physical universe became the language between the creative intelligence and each individual. They also forgot that it is the only language of unquestionable validity between one individual and another. Their "state" was no less a fictitious entity than those purportedly created by a group-god, even though the fiction was created by a fully conscious method in open discussion.

We always need to keep in mind that individuals can make agreements with each other and act together as a group, but when they presume to synthesize a group "will" — something more than an individual's will and less than the will of the universal creative intelligence — they give up their own souls. So the Greek "state" was not really different from the age-old serpent or dragon; it was the same old reality-defying attempt to destructively-absorb individual wills and souls in favor of creating a "will" and "soul" for the group as a whole.

History indicates that life in Greece was better than most places but the cause for the difference needs to be clearly remembered. The "Golden Age of Greece" was built upon the thought and behavior patterns which people had retained from the time when they had consciously upheld individual sovereignty without equivocation. The momentum of such thought and behavior patterns continues for several centuries, even when no conscious traditions perpetuate it; and it was the momentum of a morality based on individualism — not the form of the "state" — that resulted in the glory of Greece.

Considering Greece as it affected the cultural whirlpool that concerns us, we need to look at the Greek attitude toward "gods."

Because the Greeks replaced the group-god, as the "will" of the serpent, with laws that everyone knew were man-made, they had the old problem of communicating with people who had always thought in terms of group-gods. Like the northern Europeans, they originally viewed everything as evolved directly from the aboriginal creative intelligence of the universe. Consequently, if they were to call the aboriginal oneness "god," then every animal, every tree, every human would be called a descendant of god. All would be viewed as discrete gods or children of god.

An individual person who seemed to exemplify the finest of qualities, qualities which they perceived as the inherited traits of the universal creative intelligence, they spoke of in complimentary terms as being a god. They said that she or he "is a god" as we might say of a beautiful girl "she is a princess," or of a man whose behavior we admired "he is a prince of a fellow." This did not mean that they looked upon the praised individual as others looked

upon a group-god. To them "god" did not refer to a person whose verbally expressed will should overrule the will of others. "God" referred to the qualities of a person — not to a "position of authority." Among them an individual human "god" was not someone to be worshiped or obeyed, but simply to be admired as an extraordinarily good example of someone in harmony with total reality.

The thought pattern of the northern Europeans was that the aboriginal creative intelligence had deliberately divided itself into all the things existing in the universe. The purpose of this division was joy in diversity. When they went into Greece they were faced with a necessity for dealing with those who thought and talked in terms of hypothesized group-gods, jealous of other group-gods. Trying to communicate in this thought pattern, they made artful creations of type-personalities for fictional gods. They discussed the possible relations of these fictional gods to each other, and the possible relations of these fictional gods to humans. The result was a pantheon of fictional gods, whereby they tried to portray various personality possibilities more effectively than such things could be pointed out in well-known flesh and blood humans. For example, their fictionalized pantheon included a goddess of the hunt, a goddess of love, a father-figure for all the gods, et cetera.

The significant thing was that these gods were definitely not group-gods — they were not hypothesized beings whose "will" was supposedly passed on to a group leader to become the "authoritative" group "will." In Greece, everyone recognized that group "will" was synthesized and declared "law" by ordinary men coming together in open discussion.

In both thought and practice the Greeks, themselves, had deteriorated from the individual sovereignty they had known before accepting the task of making a "government" for slaves seeking a master. However they tried to give something to those who knew no way of life other than to obey laws supposed to have come from a group-god; they tried to give them a demonstration that there can be a separation between group "civil government" and an individual's concept of the universe, commonly called religion. In this they failed. Very likely it cannot be done. But they did accent the distinction between the universal creative intelligence and the myriad group-gods, each claimed by its serpent-group as being the one and only true god.

MORE BACKGROUND FOR JESUS

Three hundred years before the birth of Jesus, Alexander of Greece conquered all the peoples surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. In the areas of the conquered peoples he built Greek-sample-cities that carried on the Greek way of life and Greek thought pattern. This Greek thought pattern only went part-way across the difference between the thought pattern of the still secluded northern Europeans and that of people controlled by their obedience to group-gods. At best, it was only a half-way preparation for what was to come. Still, around the area where Jesus was born, thirteen of these three-hundred-year-old Greek cities were still spreading their influence at the time of Jesus.

By this time, however, the Romans, who had been fighting the Greeks for two hundred years, had taken over the Greek command of all the peoples around the Mediterranean Sea.

The Romans, who were a mixture of peoples having various thought patterns, had come together with apparently no criterion for human relations but expedience in determining their method for gaining and holding power. They had the spectacular Greek successes for a model and, using anything that worked, they imitated the ways of the Greeks. As a result, many of the things they did had the emptiness that comes from an imitation. Their "state," which had a senate similar to the Greek idea of people discussing how to run a state, took on the dominant characteristics of the age-old serpent. The gods in their pantheon took on the characteristics of group-gods. Lacking the background and creative impulse that had resulted in the Greek pantheon, the Romans simply took Greek art and made from it a pantheon of multiple group-gods. Ceremony replaced understanding; the ego-flattering prestige, arising from a claimed mystic or secret knowledge, replaced the effort to communicate. The Roman mystic religion — although it involved multiple gods — was used as a single group-god had always been used — to inspire obedience to the voice of a serpent.

Thus at the time of Jesus there were serpents, and empires of serpents, in the area. The thought pattern that had come down, by way of the Greeks, from those committed to individual sovereignty was diluted until it was almost unrecognizable. A few might have been found who would have chosen to resist the age-old brainwashing that it was immoral to oppose the word control of serpents. But anyone wanting to criticize such psuedo-morality had to be careful not to go so far as to be tried for treason. However

plenty of people were ready to listen to one with enough courage to advocate rejecting the control over them exercised by "authorities."

There was no room in the inn when Jesus was born, but the area was ready for Jesus. It is not surprising that our calendar dates from his birth; the time also was ready.

JESUS

Now, almost two thousand years after Jesus, there are well over five hundred Christian sects, each claiming that its adherents have the only accurate interpretation of what is written in the Bible about his birth, teachings, and crucifixion. There seems to be full agreement that he was born of a Jewish mother, was baptized by John, and, like John, directed strong criticism and admonitions toward the Jews. Like John he referred to them as being serpents, and repeatedly called them a generation of vipers, that is, small deadly serpents. Matt. 12:34. Matt. 23:33.

During the time of Jesus, the Jewish serpent was under the greater power of the Roman serpent. Jesus was crucified by Roman soldiers, following a trial whereby the Romans found him "not guilty" but, none the less, carried out his crucifixion because he was condemned to death by the Jews.

Because Jesus had a Jewish mother, and presumably was brought up under Jewish customs, present day Jews usually claim that Christianity is just a branch of Judaism. That claim, by those who crucified and still reject him, adds to the confusion already caused by over five hundred Christian sects.

The life of Jesus, which was written down by four persons over a period of about 30 to 90 years after his crucifixion, and then "officially" modified about 200 years later, can obviously be given various interpretations. Of course the conditions under which it was recorded made for inaccuracies. But lack of clarity would doubtless still exist if the recorded accuracy of his words was absolute.

Most words have fuzzy meanings at best; often one word may have two or more meanings that clearly oppose each other. Jesus was talking to people who had been taught something radically different from what he was telling them, so it was difficult to reach their innate understanding through the labyrinth of false ideas that had been overlaid upon it. Also he had to be careful not to say things that could be construed as treason — that is, he had to be careful not to speak out with total clarity against accepted "authority." It was a narrow path he had to walk and, as might be

expected he was often questioned by people looking for treasonous remarks He had to be careful what he said to those who wanted to trap him Also he had to be careful how he phrased everything he said to those who sincerely wanted to hear with understanding. He needed to avoid alienating them by triggering the defenses against all opposing ideas that are built into every word-control system. To give examples:

He said that he was not there to condemn the law but that, through him, the law might be fulfilled. That could be interpreted that he was talking about the Jewish law, the Roman law, or the natural law of the universal creative intelligence.

Another time: Those who were seeking to convict him for treason tried to trap him into making some treasonous statement. They ask him, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not?" Mark 12:14. The Jews were then secretly opposing the power of the Romans. If he answered "No" it would be treason against the Romans, while if he answered "Yes" the Jews could say that he was siding with the Romans against the Jews. Jesus told them to show a coin; then asked whose face was on it, which was that of the Roman Caesar. His comment, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things are are God's" deprived them of the treasonous statement they were trying to get. Mark 12:17.

The above statement was often later interpreted as approval by Jesus of both state and church. Clearly the words do not say that anything belongs to Caesar. Also they do not define what the word "god" means within the context of that particular statement.

Throughout all history people have been word controlled and the word "god" is usually involved in this control. Much of the trouble comes from the fact that the word is given a variety of meanings. It is often very difficult to know what one's most intimate friends mean when they use the word. The question of what Jesus meant whenever he used the word lies at the heart of much controversy. Certainly the word, itself, cannot explain his meaning when he used it.

Jesus never advocated the group-god who purportedly said to Moses, "Thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God." Ex. 34:14. Obviously such a god could not be the creative intelligence of the entire universe; the universal creative intelligence would not imply the existence of, or be jealous of, other gods.

Jesus never advocated a god that gave messages in words to a group-leader. Nor did he ever advocate a god that made a covenant with one group of people to the hurt of others. He never advocated

a god that said to the leader of a chosen group of people, "Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not: for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries." Ex. 23:20-22. There is more than abundant evidence that the god of the Jews was a typical group-god.

The word "god" was often avoided by Jesus. He reached for a new word. The reason why he had to do this is fully understandable. He had to try reaching people's inborn intelligence that had been perverted by word control. He was faced with the problem of presenting a concept to replace that of a group-god.

All, who do not think of themselves as being human computers, must believe that creative intelligence exists in the universe — because they perceive creative intelligence in themselves. Unless they have wandered off into that field of madness where they think that theirs is the only intelligence — unless they think that they, themselves, created and can manipulate everyone around them — they believe that intelligence existed in their fathers, and in their father's fathers, back to some beginning that may be difficult for them to perceive, or even conceive. No matter how far back we are able to conceive that the creative intelligence, which exists in ourselves, may have existed before us — whether only in humans, in all "higher" animals, in all organic life, or before there was a physical universe — it is a reasonable figure of speech to call the aboriginal creative intelligence "our father." Jesus apparently used the word "father" when talking about the aboriginal creative intelligence of the universe. He used the word "god" at various times, sometimes as an alternate for the creative intelligence that he spoke of as father, and perhaps sometimes in talking to others of a god that he knew was different from the god spoken of as his father.

Clearly when Jesus spoke of father as "god" he was not talking of a god that only related to a people as a group. His father was not a god one approached as a "part" of a people deserving preferential treatment, a preferential treatment to be claimed because of an exclusive covenant — nor any covenant. If Jesus called the aboriginal father by the term god, he was then talking about a god totally unlike the god of the Jews; he was using the same word to mean a god who related to individuals. To show the difference, Jesus condemned those who prayed in the streets, thanking their

god that they were better than other men. Luke 18:11. He told people to go home, find a place where they could be alone and pray after this manner, "Our Father ... Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." Matt. 6:6-10. The god of Jesus, was a father of individuals — not a father of groups.

The god of Jesus was not a god of people pooling their power as a group. The god of Jesus was not even a god exclusively concerned with humans. The same god was concerned with the well-being of the smallest sparrow, and with the well-being of the lillies of the field, that neither toiled nor made their own clothes, yet were dressed far more beautifully than "Solomon in all his glory." Luke 12:27.

The god of Jesus was radically different from the god of the Jews; also the values of Jesus were diametrically opposed to Jewish values. There was no such thing as borrowing all the jewels from neighbors when one planned to poison their first born and run away with so many of their possessions that it would spoil them. There was no waging war on another group of people who had brought a land to high productivity — in order to feast on the milk and honey others had produced. Jesus expressed his values by saying, "Take no thought for your life, what you shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what you shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" Matt. 6:25. Of the life he had chosen for himself, he said, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the son of man has not where to lay his head." Matt. 8:20.

He offered no such commandments as Moses had offered on stone — all designed for only one purpose: To keep the group together as a tightly knit power, seeking possessions and guarding those possessions, under the direction of a leader who alone could communicate with the group-god. Instead of obedience to laws and a leader, he advocated unequivocal respect for the silent voice within each person. Mark 3:28-29 quotes the words of Jesus: "Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of external damnation." He valued individual perception wherever he found it, even in a Roman soldier. Matt. 8:5-13. And he said of children (who had not been brain-washed with words), "of such is the kingdom of God." Mark 10:14. He did not praise those skilled in quoting law. Instead he said, "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." Matt. 5:8.

The god of Jesus was different from that of the Jews. His values were different from those of the Jews. And now we come to his teachings as regards relations between humans. These also are different. He did not try to bring a group together to form a serpent that would eat up other serpents. His teachings, and methods of propagating them, were those of individuals.

He recognized that training for group action — particularly in a Jewish household — often begins in the family. So he said that, in dealing with each other as individuals, it might even be necessary to set members of the family against each other. In Matt. 10:35, he says, "I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother."

Always looking for evidence of perception manifest in each individual human, he showed great joy when he found such perception in one of his disciples and demonstrated his approval of what he perceived. He said to Peter, the perceptive individual — not to the group as a group: "upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. 16:18.

Building upon perceptive individuals, without giving a leader "authority" over followers, takes time — often generations — and Jesus recognized the difficulty of the method he was choosing. Especially he recognized that not many Jews, to whom he was originally trying to limit his message, were ready to accept such a slow unflamboyant process. He did not try to push too hard. Instead he said, "No man putteth new wine into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles and be spilled. ... No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better." Luke 5:37-39.

Much of his teachings referred to the natural world; his method of propagating those teachings was that of waiting for organic growth — as opposed to quick, group-organizational methods. He said, "The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." Matt. 13:31-32.

In contrast to the nature comparison for the kingdom of heaven, he said of those who were proud of their endlessly complicated laws and tedious "sacred" ceremonies, "ye are like unto whitened sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. ... Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers; how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. 23:27-33.

Those who lived by the serpent system, constantly tried to provoke him into making treasonous statements. He skillfully avoided the traps they laid.

When the time was ripe, he drew the tension tighter between himself and those who looked upon him as an "unauthorized" challenger of "sacred" laws and traditions. The contrast had been carefully drawn and he saw that the contrast had been made abundantly clear. The way of the serpent was the way of kings and people-as-a-group — all creating unreal entities that existed only as words. The way of the serpent was pooling individual will and action to make the hypothesized "will" that directed action for a group. It offered the temptation of a quick way to obtain the wealth and power of the world. But as "parts" of serpents, individuals lose their own souls. Jesus presented the searching question: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Mark 8:36.

No one has ever given a reasoned defense of the serpent's way. The answer never comes in words seeking to express reason. Then, even as throughout all the present world, people accustomed to word control lay in wait for any individual who openly dares to condemn groupism as immoral. Any defiance of the pseudo-morality that individuals should be sacrificed for the good of the group is called "treasonous" or "unpatriotic." These words have been given a connotation, or emotional charge, designating the vilest persons imaginable. The group-hatred triggered against an individual by the connotation of the words is the only defense of the serpent way that comes from those who give up their own souls to become part of an imaginary serpent soul.

At his last supper Jesus set an example of communion between equal individuals who might remember and honor him for what he was doing. Then he went out into the garden, where groups seeking to silence him would find him communing with his father, which was also the father of the trees under whose branches he prayed.

With full knowledge of what he was doing, he had chosen his own time to confront and let loose the hatred of those who he knew would put him to death. Beforehand he had said of his life, "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." John 10:18. He offered this explanation: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." John 12:24.

Jesus left no commandments carved on stone, he wrote no books, nor did he establish any ceremonies for worshipping a god. He established no organizations; that is to say, he created no ser-

pent to eat up other serpents. He knew that such a system never gets rid of the last one. Instead, acting as if he were the most ordinary individual son of man, he tried to show others the way back to the kingdom of heaven, the way that their communion with serpents had closed away from them.

His life was not something that others need to imitate; that would give other lives the emptiness of all imitations. Also the significance of his life and death would not be increased by one duplication, nor by a million such duplications. His life and death made the complete, supremely eloquent statement — in the language of reality — for all who had been lured from the kingdom of heaven by word-created-serpents.

His life and death demonstrated the unreconcilable relationship between all such serpents and one who, with understanding, could call the universal creative intelligence, father. It remained only for others to see that significance in Jesus as a reality, for others to accept the way pointed by Jesus as opposed to the way of the fictitious group serpent, and for others to point out that way to everyone throughout the world of word-controlled-people who had lost their souls by accepting the words of the serpent. The significant message of Jesus was this: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:14-15.

THE GREEKS LOOK AT JESUS

Moses was a serpent maker. He had lifted up a serpent in competition against other serpents. But Jesus had said, "The law and the prophets were until John." Luke 16:16.

Jesus asked that he, himself, be lifted up — as the way, the truth, and the light. The significance of this cannot be overestimated. It could have been the turning point of history. For the salvation of those who would accept him, a god of individuals had now come among humans to replace the group-gods presented by those who advocate the way of serpents.

Whether or not the miracles attributed to Jesus indicate non-human power cannot be known, any more than we can have positive knowledge regarding similar things that often happen before our eyes now. And one's opinion about these things does not affect the significance of the total. Also one's opinion as to whether Jesus was born of a virgin or whether he rose from the dead and again appeared to others in the flesh does not affect the significance of Jesus as a total reality.

The important thing that had happened is this: As an integrated whole, the life, death, and teachings of Jesus offered salvation to the whole human species that, throughout all history, has been headed for damnation — because humans have been moving in a direction that opposes the manifest direction of the universal creative intelligence.

To escape damnation everyone who has become a "part" of a fictitious "group-whole" must reject the way of the serpent, must reject all group-gods, of which the group-god of the Jews is the prime example, and must be "born again" as an integrated individual.

Throughout all history, serpent-dominated individuals have wanted to find a kingdom not of the serpent world that surrounded them. They have always known that they could be persons of integrity, that they could be more than mere "parts" of a fictitious something.

By nature, humans are moral animals; that is to say, humans are conscious of the creative intelligence within them; they want to use their own discrete intelligence for creations which are in harmony with the creative intelligence of the total universe. The pseudo-morality advocated by the serpent makers overrules those who disagree with it — and turns them in the opposite direction. This is easily done because a lone individual often lacks the moral courage to follow his own judgment when that means bucking the tide of public opinion. The individual feels insecure when faced with millions of his own species who obey an "authority" giving directions in words that millions press upon the lone individual with force-backed self-righteousness.

Jesus made his whole being an unequivocal statement saying: An individual's transgression against the holy spirit within him is the one unforgivable thing that will lead to eternal damnation. He taught, lived and died as an individual. He asked all who would be saved from damnation to follow him, to recognize that an individual's worth came from the creative intelligence of the universe — and was greater than the law and the prophets. His teachings gave all people the message of their worth as individuals, then told them to accept, as their continuing teacher, the holy spirit that would be with them after he was gone.

Many failed to understand. But when the Greeks looked at the life, death, and teachings of Jesus, a chord of almost forgotten memories was struck. That chord vibrated with a harmonious yes-saying.

The Greeks had been trying to present their concepts of the

aboriginal creative intelligence to people whose language was group-gods. They had not been successful. In fact, their efforts had even produced a reverse effect — had produced greater misunderstanding. The Romans took the artful attempts the Greeks made at self-expression and turned them into a whole pantheon of group-gods.

Now the Greeks saw that something miraculous had happened. From the very midst of the Jews — who had the most deliberate, most studied, and most unequivocal adherence to a group-god of any known people — came Jesus. In the life, death, and teachings of the flesh-and-blood-Jesus the Greeks saw a full-blown reality of what their almost forgotten heritage cried out.

Logos, in the Greek language, means the creative idea that exists, unexpressed, within the universal creative intelligence before it is made into a tangible reality. There is no word in the English language comparable to logos — because the thought pattern that was common to the Greeks, the East Indians, and the early northern Europeans is no longer common enough among English speaking peoples for us to have a single word to express it. In English, logos is usually translated into "word." "Word" is a ludicrous caricature for "logos," if not its diametrical opposite. Fortunately, we can understand the Greek thought when we see "logos" in context of both language and thought. The thought has already been presented in the life, death, and teachings of Jesus. The Greek thought pattern becomes clear when we look again at the integrated whole put into Greek words.

The Greeks had been trying to make things simple by expressing aspects of the universal creative intelligence, and had found themselves helpless to get their ideas across to peoples committed to group-gods, each claiming that its own jealous god was the one and only god of the universe. In Jesus they were able to see, not merely a single aspect of the aboriginal creative intelligence, but the whole of the thing they had been trying to express. In Jesus they could see the total universal creative intelligence, living as a discrete individual among the serpent makers. They could see Jesus as the total aboriginal intelligence trying to communicate with word-controlled people in garbled word-language — in man made words that deny reality as the only valid language of the universal creative intelligence. They recognized that Jesus put into words a great, illuminating truth that transcended words, when he said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; ... I am in the Father, and the Father in me." John 14:9-11.

This truth is presented from the Greek perspective in the first

chapter of the Gospel according to Saint John. Originally written in Greek it says: "In the beginning was the logos, and the logos was with God, and the logos was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." (That is to say, such things as a body politic or a group-god, created by men in their imaginations and called real because given a name, have no reality.) John goes on, clearly speaking — not of a group-god — but of the aboriginal creative intelligence: "And the logos was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." John 1:1-14.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH MAKES A SERPENT OF JUDAEO-"CHRISTIANITY"

All who had seen and heard about Jesus had long been conditioned to think only of serpent ways. Immediately they began to form groups that differed with other groups on the meaning each placed on what Jesus had said and done. His life, death, and teachings were an integrated whole — but the people tried to divide him into pieces from which to make competing group-gods. In accordance with their word-conditioning, they wanted an "authority" expressed in words. As a result, many failed to see the total reality. They sought for a "Christian" morality without rejecting the diametrically opposing way of the serpent. They continued to focus on words.

Jesus had said that if someone hits you on one cheek, turn the other; and if a Roman soldier orders you to go along with him and carry his load for a mile, then offer to go with him another mile. Taken by itself, this could be confusing to one looking for a word-stated morality. The Jewish serpent was then "existing" under the tolerance of the Roman serpent. About 40 years later Roman tolerance came to an end, but at the time of Jesus each Jew was seen by other Jews as having openly expressed allegiance to the Roman serpent and secret allegiance to the Jewish serpent. If one did not openly support the Roman serpent, nor contribute to the secret Jewish revolutionary plans, it was ordinary prudence to irritate neither those committed to Jewish nor to Roman "authority." This is ordinary expedience for an individual caught in a world of serpent ways — who chooses not to call upon one of the serpents for group protection. Such ordinary expedience becomes a moral statement only if, along with the total teachings of Jesus, it is seen as saying: Take no part in the ways of the serpent. In the parable of the good Samaritan, Jesus made it clear that the

love of neighbor which he advocated dealt with individuals — and did not recognize serpent type groupings. Luke 10:30-37.

Since everyone knew only serpent ways, there was no framework or thought pattern among those to whom he spoke, for talking of personal relations in a kingdom of heaven. "Authority" was everyone's concern. "Authority" was a creation of words. Everyone thought, talked, and examined words for their legalistic meaning as an expression of "authority." Following this practice, they examined the words of Jesus as isolated statements.

The meaning of "kingdom of heaven," "kingdom of god," and "my kingdom is not of this world" constituted a big point of differences among various groups. Some insisted that Jesus referred to a world after death, others that he referred to a better way of life on earth. Luke 17:20-21, quotes Jesus as saying, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or lo, there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you."

Both the teachings and the life and death of Jesus were clear and easily understood by an unconditioned child. Matt. 18:3, quotes the words of Jesus: "Unless ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven."

Adults were less capable of understanding than unconditioned children. For thousands of years words had been used to overrule the perception and understanding of people, to make them slaves to "authorities" advocating group-gods. Remembered serpent words and ideas mutilated clear thought immediately after Jesus, even as they have continued to do for two thousand years. They became like weeds growing among the seeds Jesus had planted. Those following Jesus all too often formed a group of individuals who saw themselves as a group because they contrasted themselves to other groups as groups. The holy spirit, that the individual was to know as the one true guide never to be transgressed against, was even interpreted by some as the community spirit.

The Greek thought pattern, the Jewish thought pattern, the Roman thought pattern, and many others swirled around and created a maelstrom of word confusion.

Among the Jews, Jesus was looked upon as a renegade daring to question the holiness of their ancient traditions. They had long experience in silencing opposition, and Jesus even had the audacity to choose the occasion of the "sacred" Passover Feast as his time for an all-out confrontation of the very tradition being celebrated. After he was silenced, and the Roman soldiers had added the final ridicule to the Jews by placing a sign "King of the Jews" over the pathetic, spit-upon-figure hanging on the cross, the majority of

Jews thought the sooner they could forget the whole incident the better.

Certainly the new wine Jesus offered would have broken the old bottles. Those who tried to benefit from the enthusiasm he had generated in his followers sought to interpret his life and death as if it were a fulfillment of Jewish prophecies. But the majority of Jews would have none of that. The new Jewish Sect, as simply a split-off from traditional Judaism, soon died out.

Jesus had used a parable about a wheat sower to describe the organic method he had chosen for spreading his significant message. Mark 4:3-20. The accuracy of the parallel became more apparent as time went on. Under cover of night many serpent eggs were sown among the corns of wheat. As he had foreseen, there were many claiming to do great things in his name to whom he would have said, "I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Matt. 7:23.

Less than three hundred years after his crucifixion, there were already over a hundred sects calling themselves "Christians." Apparently the differences between them were much wider than such differences now. Some opposed serpent methods and were actively persecuted by the Romans. Others sought to profit by their conformity with various facets of the status quo.

Paul, whose letters became part of the New Testament, helped promote a whole chain of churches and injected the idea that the crucifixion of Jesus was in keeping with Jewish practices of offering blood sacrifices to propitiate the jealous Jewish group-god. Among some sects the whole Jewish Bible was actually attached to the growing aggregation of prescribed practices for the administration of churches that went under the name of "Christian."

Clearly some of the churches were moving in the direction of becoming serpents. And, as might be expected, the most ambitious serpent makers tied their new semi-organisms to the Jewish Bible; it was, and still is, the world's most comprehensive manual for serpent makers.

Combining the Jewish Bible with the diametrically opposite message of Jesus made a formidable aggregate of confused ideas. Such confusion opened a field of competition between those seeking to become "authorities." Some leaders, who had developed elaborate dogmas and formed groups of word-controlled followers, sought to have the Roman Emperor give his approval to their group and its' dogmas — to set them up as the "officially" recognized head of all who called themselves Christians. The Emperor Constantine, after switching back and forth several times

between the leaders of various serpent-making sects, finally made a definite choice. The church under this leader was permitted to be the one "officially" called the "Christian Church" with the Emperor's approval. The leader could speak with "authority" for all "Christianity."

The leader of the imperially "authorized" church, now called the Pope, claimed "authority" in words, not only from the Emperor but also from Jesus, himself. Jesus had acknowledge perception in an individual by saying: Upon this rock I will build my church and I give you the keys to the kingdom of heaven; whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. That — in the non-verbal world and the language of reality — is what the aboriginal creative intelligence said, and continues to say, to all perceptive humans — and to all other forms of life. There is no limit to what an individual can accomplish so long as one offers no unperceptive opposition to the direction of the universal creative intelligence. Among humans, the damned are those who listen to the voice of the serpent, and let words deflect the direction pointed by their native perception. The "authorized" misinterpretation, which the Pope put on the words Jesus had used to acknowledge Peter's perception, was that Jesus had appointed Peter the first Pope, and had given him, and all succeeding Popes, absolute "authority" over the entire world.

The Pope arrogated to himself this unique word-controlling "authority" by means of his "official position." He used this "position" to make his sect into the Catholic (or universal) Church, and to wipe out all true Christians, who, of course, opposed serpent-making practices.

About a hundred years later, the Roman Emperor gave the Catholic Church "authority" to use force in wiping out any remaining Christians, who opposed the Church's serpent-making practices. With this "authority" the Catholic Church became a full-fledged serpent.

About two hundred years later, the Roman serpent had been so weakened by fighting other serpents, that the Church took control of what was left of the Roman Empire. The Church serpent then set out to become truly universal and to control the earth.

But meanwhile another serpent had come along, that is to say, another source of word-control was making individuals into a slightly different semi-organism.

MOHAMMED

Serpent making is mob-stimulation combined with mob-control.

It is the old carrot and stick routine used to control jackasses. The words usually supply the carrot, and a well-organized police force usually becomes the stick. Then, when the time is ripe, the mob is stimulated by words and used for mass warfare.

The Jewish serpent, as historically known, had its beginning while the Jews were under the stick of the Egyptians. While Moses held out the word-carrot of a full-fledged Jewish serpent to the Jews, their fear of Egyptian reprisals for their sabotaging actions was sufficient to keep them on course — until they were alone. Then Moses had to make his own stick, which he did without hesitation.

The Romans did not have a very effective carrot for inducing mass fanaticism until the Catholic Church became identified with Roman Power. Then, before the Catholic Church became fully effective, Mohammed came on the world scene. He was a careful observer — and he was born in the very middle of the verbal snake-pit. He looked at the ways of serpents and set out to make a serpent of his own.

Mohammed had observed the power that words have to overrule individual perception. He could neither read nor write but he was impressed with the idea that the Jewish Bible, as it had been used by the Catholic Church, had swallowed up and substantially destroyed the teachings of Jesus — because it was a written book. To create a greater serpent than any that existed, he could see that a book like that of the Jews would be useful — a book that people accepted as being the actual written words of their god. Mohammed obviously did not want to be as ambiguous as Moses and claim that the god of the universe ratified some unstated human laws. He, at least, tried to make one complete package but, like Moses, he wanted serpent-making words. He said that the Koran was dictated to him by the Angel Gabriel and had others write down for him what the angel purportedly dictated.

The Koran claims the same unique and final monotheism proclaimed by all the myriad group-gods since long before any known history. Mohammed made a point of emphasizing this "one and only true god" more strongly even than all the others had done. The Koran ordered the followers to repeat over and over, conspicuously and aloud, five times a day: "There is one god, Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet."

When looking at the Koran in total, one clearly sees that Mohammed was creating a group-god — not pointing out the universal creative intelligence as Jesus had done. But the universal appeal of Jesus could not fail to impress upon Mohammed the idea

that the Jews had made a strategic mistake in claiming to be a separate or "chosen people." The Roman Empire had claimed to be universal. Now the "Official Christian" Church was called "Catholic," or universal. The power it was accumulating must have impressed him that universality was the expedient way for him to go. The Kingdom of Islam, consisting of all who obeyed the Koran, was designed to be universal.

The Catholic Church could be seen by Mohammed to have created a future trouble for itself by tying itself to the Jewish Bible and Jewish serpent-making laws, when Jesus had opposed Jewish teachings. To avoid such obvious contradictions, the Koran set up its own laws in great detail and was as complete in itself as Mohammed was able to make it. However, it avoided possible confrontations by saying that Moses had been adequate to his time, and Jesus had been adequate to his time, but that both had been prophets — not gods — and the Koran gave Mohammed the place of the last and greatest prophet. Since Islam was designed to include everyone in the world, it was expedient to acknowledge the lesser greatness, for their times, of the other "prophets" that people might be reluctant to give up. Mohammed said that Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Alexander of Greece, and several others had been "inspired."

Mohammed had been a camel driver. He knew full well that no one can control camels, jackasses, or mobs of people made into a semi-organism, by carrots alone — at least not until they have been so fully trained that they go through routine motions without any thought of opposition. A stick is necessary in the initial training. He could see in Catholic "Christianity" nothing but another group-god serpent as the Nomadic Jewish Nation had always been. He could see that Catholic "Christianity" got its serpent-making stick when it linked up with the Roman Empire. He could compare the sticks used by the Jews and the Catholics-become-Romans.

For their stick, the Jews had shown a preference for underhanded methods, even to the point of having their women prostitute themselves to manipulate or stab an enemy king, but the Jews had also done some of the bloodiest butchering ever known; they had proudly made their record of it part of their Bible. However, Moses, at first perhaps a little too proud of the underhanded methods the Jews had used so successfully in Egypt, had thought that they could always rely exclusively on the same sort of methods. Moses had been rash enough to say that his god had given him a commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." Mohammed was not so inconsistent. He knew that a stick was always used in serpent making. He was more honest about it than Moses had been. However, he

was not entirely honest. He knew that aggressive warfare is waged with greater vigor when it is called defensive.

The Koran made "holy war" a commandment. According to Mohammed, the Angel Gabriel dictated the words: "Fight in the path of god against those who fight against you, but be not the aggressor, for verily god loveth not the aggressors. And slay them wherever you find them, and drive them out of the places where they drove you out, for persecution is worse than slaughter. But if they desist, then verily god is forgiving, merciful."

Then the final carrot was supplied to promote "holy war." It was supplied from the Catholic "authorized" version of the kingdom of heaven. The Koran said that the spirits of those who died for their god would live after death in a place that was ideal — ideal in the master-slave thought pattern of "civilized" people. It went on to say that all who died without following the teachings of the Koran would go to a hell of eternal torment, again in the thought pattern of "civilized" or serpent people, living by mass warfare — those who know what it means to fall into the hands of a mass warfare enemy.

There is no evidence that Mohammed ever saw the salvation that Jesus was offering those who, throughout all known history, had listened to serpent-makers and had lost their individual souls to become "parts" of serpents. Presumably Mohammed had no conception of a world without serpents. That is not unusual. Today the great majority of people look only at the word-created serpent world and have the same word-conditioned blindness to the world of enduring reality.

For a long time it looked as if Mohammed was indeed the last and greatest of the serpent-makers. In a century and a half, Islam "swallowed up" most of the Roman Empire and was also extended in the other direction over much of India.

THE GERMANS

Moral, as used here, means what appears to be most in keeping with the observed, long-range direction of the universal creative intelligence.

In non-human animals, morality, or lack of it, can be seen only after their acts. After thousands of years have established their direction, the morality, or lack of it, in non-verbal animals can be seen in their evolutionary development; some evolve further, some become extinct, others regress — return to an evolutionary stage that had already been surpassed.

Using words, humans have the ability to state their direction

before they act. When humans with such ability see individual efforts at self-expression ridiculed and mocked at by a force-backed word-conditioned group, their frustrated desire for self-expression becomes pent-up violence. Then they act without declaring their direction. This condition is called "anarchy." As night follows day, anarchy follows the fellow-feeling desire to state one's direction, when attempted word control, resulting in word-created confusion, has made all attempts to communicate individual perception appear futile.

When humans come into conflict, either in a state of anarchy or in the word-stimulated mass warfare that characterizes serpents, their actions become horrifyingly incomprehensible to non-verbal animals. Their behavior is not animal; non-verbal animals are unable to perceive the word-conditioned insanity motivating humans. Group-imposed word conditioning, that distorts the innate perception of individuals, is the basic cause of all such worse-than-animal horror.

Unquestionably groups have power to dominate — to control or destroy — individuals. Under demagoggs this group power becomes group tyranny. A clearly stated course of action must be one of two things. It must be either: (1) Group support of individual sovereignty, or (2) Group sovereignty imposed on individuals who reject it. Any attempt to compromise the two opposing directions can only result in confusion and horror.

Group sovereignty, forced on individuals by a word-manipulated group, is the way of the serpent. The advocates of such a direction have always claimed that anyone who advocated individual sovereignty was immoral. The Jews, among whom Jesus was born, had a fully documented history of advocating the pseudo-morality of groupism.

Jesus was crucified but his life, death, and teachings proclaimed the morality that individuals should be guided by the holy spirit within them — not by the word-stated pseudo-morality of groupism, not by the law and the prophets. He so lived that the only accusation which could be made against him was the fact that he advocated individual sovereignty. Because no other accusation was possible, his crucified figure became a shining light that illuminated his message with unmistakable clarity. Deliberately he chose the final confrontation with groupism, so as to make the ultimate statement of which any individual is capable. He knew that, if the statement he made with his whole being was accepted as a statement of the universal creative intelligence, it could bring salvation to all the group-dominated individuals of the world. Individuals could then

find the necessary confidence in the still, silent voice born within them to resist the blatant, word-expressed pseudo-morality of groupism.

Now we are going to look at a people fully committed to individual sovereignty, a whole people sufficiently great in numbers so that they could have effectively opposed the direction of an encroaching serpent.

When the Roman Empire began encroaching on the people of northern Europe, the native tribes there might be compared to the American Indians as they were when the northern Europeans — after becoming "civilized" — began encroaching on them. The "civilized" Romans called them "utterly immoral barbarians."

There were differences among the various tribes of northern Europe, as there were among American Indian tribes. Some historians make a distinction between the Teutonic tribes and the Celtic tribes, because of language and because the Celts had some semblance of group-gods. The Celts also had druids (or priests) whom they accepted as spokesmen for their gods. The Teutonic peoples had neither group-gods nor druids. Perhaps the greater difference was simply that the Celts were located in a belt that formed a passage between Rome and the British Isles and were the first to be "civilized." The Roman armies forced their way through this area and subjugated both the area of passage and the isles of Britain, where there were some more of the same "barbarians." At the time of maximum Roman power this belt was called Gaul. The area further east was called Germany.

Writers at the time of the Roman Empire called all the northern European people, who had not been subjugated, Germans. The great majority of people now in America, the British Isles, Scandinavia, and Europe are descendants of these German tribes — Angles, Goths, Franks, Saxons, et cetera — but most of the American, British and Scandinavian Germans have fought two wars in this century against a small portion still in the heart of what was originally called Germany. That small remaining portion is all that many now mean by the word German. The word "German" has come to carry the connotation of "foreign enemy."

The confusion of the word "German" is unavoidable because we cannot talk about the original people without using the word in the way it was used two thousand years ago — as "American Indian" is used in the United States. German, as I am using it, means all German tribes, which includes the ancestors of most people in America, the United Kingdom, present day Europe, Scandinavia, et cetera. However, it is not blood-heredity that provides interest

here; it is the remaining traces of prehistory thought patterns. We are looking at the fork in the road; we are looking at a time when our ancestors had started down the other fork, when they had chosen the direction of individual sovereignty. A point of great interest is that they had chosen their direction with full knowledge of the opposite fork. They were not only consciously rejecting the other fork, they were consciously resisting influences that would press them in the way many others were going. Civilization and non-civilization were not indicators of the two directions. The manufactured products of "civilization" were incidental and not part of the choice. The issue was morality — harmony or lack of harmony with the direction of the universal creative intelligence — individualism or groupism.

The American Indians, at least in most areas, had no knowledge of and no pressures upon them from group semi-organisms. They had no pressures that a word-created pseudo-morality, declaring that killing must be the exclusive prerogative of some group "authority," should replace their native perception. Our knowledge of the Incas and Aztecs is incomplete and possibly they did advocate such a pseudo-morality, but, if so, the pressure did not affect the whole Indian population of the Americas. Most Indian tribes had not been faced with the necessity for choosing at the fork of the road. They had not recognized the dangers of groupism. Tribal cohesiveness was conspicuous. The Indians even called anyone who insisted on living alone instead of with some tribe "crazy man." However, they were close enough to nature to recognize that it would be madness to say that a human could not retain his innate animal sovereignty as an individual.

Serpent makers try to frighten people with a picture of horror that would result if individuals were not held in check by restricting the use of all force to that ordered by group "authorities." The horror would doubtless be true if restrictions were lifted suddenly on dense populations that have been word conditioned for centuries. But the horror would result from the word conditioning — not the nature of the human animal. When conscious individual sovereignty has been the articulated morality for centuries, and a fair fight concept — as a way to prevent sneak attacks — has simply been added to extant animal sovereignty in nature, then the opposite is true. Where people not only feel free to do so, but also feel morally obligated, as individuals, to kill off, in a fair fight, any underhanded or unscrupulous persons among themselves, they can feel only strong love and comradeship for those who are left. There is then no need for saying what Jesus found necessary to say to the

Jews: "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you." John 15:12.

However the same evolutionary process that breeds love also breeds competent and courageous warriors. Germans successfully fought against the Roman Empire but, having individual freedom to make their own choices, some became Roman mercenaries and Roman citizens. Even at the time of Christ, as well as before and after, the Roman Emperor depended almost exclusively on German soldiers to protect him from others scheming for his throne. Their oaths of fidelity, the dependability of which was amazing to serpent people, made them one of the Emperor's most significant forces. In the case of Claudius, it even appears that the German guards made their own selection of who would be the next Emperor.

From Caesar and Tacitus, we learn that the Germans pushed back or killed off intruders, but had no thought patterns for "owning" land. In this respect they were like the American Indians, but they carried their rejection of "ownership" still further. The Germans made a point of having their chosen chiefs, or "kings" as Caesar called them, reapportion the land they cultivated every year so they would not become attached to one place. They also did not want to become attached to houses. They built minimal houses which were never in sight of each other.

Caesar and Tacitus, viewing the Germans from a "civilized" perspective, were impressed that they elected "kings" but did not seem to be subservient to them. We can go beyond the "civilized" perspective, and arrive at some understanding, when we remember Lycurgus. This real or imaginary wise-man-ruler of the Greeks refused to allow laws to be reduced to rigid form. Custom was recognized as superior to rigid laws and written laws were considered highly undesirable. Following such thought it becomes apparent that the German "king" was a symbolic figure. He was chosen to publicly personify and symbolize the ideal German, acting in the popularly approved way. The "king" was simply the man chosen to personify the German ideal. The girl chosen each year as Miss America would be a parallel if she were chosen by popular acclaim rather than by commercial interests.

No king and no word-laws ruled the German people. Word-control was not permitted to transgress against the holy spirit within each individual. Without being fully armed and ready to fight, the Germans never met for public discussions. No word-laws, handing "authority" to some "king" or "prime minister" or "senate," were made at a group meeting. It was a meeting to test the remaining tensile strength of old customs and propose new

practices or modifications of the old. Group custom recognized that power and will had always existed, and should remain, in individuals. In group meetings everyone was free to put his opinions in words. Approval was expressed by the cheering sound of beating swords against resonant shields. The sound made by that approval was the sound of the only power which can claim the manifest approval of the universal creative intelligence — that willed by the un-distorted voice of the discrete individual's deepest being.

If someone wanted to propose a fight that would require group effort, he stood up in the meeting, stated that he proposed to lead such a fight, then invited all who wanted to participate and accept his leadership to join him. Another way was for someone to point out the necessity for a fight; then those who wanted to participate would elect the best leader among themselves. Those who wanted to add their weight to a leader's effort agreed to obey his orders and stick with him until total victory or death. The fight was always for a specific purpose stated beforehand.

When not participating in such a warrior band, individuals felt free to fight each other, so long as it was a fair fight. With such readiness to fight, all the dastards, and all who tried underhanded methods to gain their ends, were bred out from among the people. Those who remained were so dependably well-behaved that it was the custom to give any stranger who asked for it a night's lodging and share one's food with him.

A contrast can be pointed up by recalling that Jesus found it necessary to advocate love for one's fellow beings among the Jews. The Jews restrained individuals from killing the unscrupulous among themselves; instead, they gave an evolutionary preference to those "whited sepulchers" who used "legal" means — that is to say, group force — to destroy individuals who were not legal-minded.

The way of life based on individual sovereignty did not propagate the unlovable. But it also did not propagate fierce fighters exclusively. There were always some who had no fighting temperament, who had a temperament only for gardening, poetry, music, caring for animals, and such things. If they did not try to replace fair fights with word-control — aimed at underhanded scheming for group or "legal" dominance — they were usually shielded by someone ready to protect them from challenges made by the overaggressive. This bred out the overaggressive at the same time that it perpetuated the sensitive — those who lived under the protection of another's shield. Early "civilized" observers remarked about the strangeness of such relationships. The one under whose

shield the sensitive lived did not treat them as "civilized" peoples treated their slaves. Obviously the one shielding others could have called attention to his "authority" over them. Instead, having no "obligation" to protect them, but protecting by personal choice, he treated them as if they were simply additional cherished members of his own family.

A German woman, who usually chose not to fight, balanced a man's ready use of the sword by cherishing and preserving what seemed good to her. Of course, she chose her mate for many varied characteristics but an important one was perception. If the man's perception was evident, then a woman could love and honor her mate, who destroyed what did not seem good in his opinion. A man recognized that a woman's judgment, in what she chose to preserve and cherish, had less pressure on it than his own; and it might therefore be much better. Accordingly, a man listened to and respected the opinions of the woman he loved almost as if she were a goddess.

Families never lived in compact villages; each family always lived out of sight of any other. Because of this the Germans were probably much closer to nature than the American Indians, and looked upon nature with even more reverence.

However, the difference that I want to emphasize between Indians and Germans, who were both close to nature, is this: The Indians had no conscious thought patterns designed to provide a defense against group tyranny. The Germans did. They were close to and fully conscious of the serpent-peoples around the Mediterranean. What the Bible usually speaks of as serpent, they called dragon, serpent, worm, or giant, depending on their attitude toward it. But they would tolerate no encroachment, neither of the semi-organism, nor of the thought patterns that produced and maintained it. The hero-stories which they kept alive dealt with a Siegfried killing dragons. Dragons or serpents were not to be tolerated. One could voluntarily give up individual sovereignty — temporarily — while following a leader in a worthwhile fight, but no German would allow his personal sovereignty to be taken from him.

The thought pattern of the Greeks had come from this source and they had compromised it slowly, bit by bit, while trying to deal with those committed to the ways of the serpent. After centuries of such compromise, the Greeks still had recognized the eternal truth in both the teachings and the life and death of Jesus. They had seen Jesus asd a discrete, crystal clear incarnation of the universal creative intelligence.

If the Greeks, after their centuries of compromise, could still recognize the god-aspect of Jesus, then certainly the Germans, who had never compromised, could not fail to recognize it. It might be said that the Germans were Christians before there was a Christ, or it might be said that Christ was a German carrying their message to the Jews. However it is put, the thought patterns were the same.

And so we now look, not at one man, Jesus, in conflict with a serpent-making people, but at a serpent encroaching on a whole, well-established, formidable people, whose way of life was what Jesus advocated.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH PROMOTES JUDAEO-“CHRISTIANITY”

During the life of Jesus, the finest armies of the old Roman Empire tried to invade the heartland of the Germans. They were totally defeated and virtually destroyed. The Germans had recognized the invasion for what it was — an invasion by a dragon, giant, or serpent — a word-controlled semi-organism. The often repeated German stories told about the ability of these semi-organisms to take on various forms, for a giant to turn itself into a dragon or serpent, for instance, or even into something resembling a harmless toad. They could defend themselves against what they recognized. But from out of the "Christianized" Roman Empire, came a new form of serpent which the Germans did not recognize for what it was.

The Catholic Church was evolved from one of the hundred or more sects calling themselves "Christian" — but its objective was not the kingdom of heaven that Jesus had pictured. It was the opposite. Its objective was the creation of a universal serpent. It did not advocate the holy spirit within an individual, as the one thing that must not be transgressed against. It advocated the opposite. It advocated obedience to the words of an "authority." Nothing in the life, death, and teachings of Jesus could support such a position, so the Church combined the "New Testament" life of Jesus and the "Old Testament" history, laws, and serpent-making practices of the Jews, into one inseparable "Holy" Bible.

Jesus had described false teachers to whom he would say "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity. I never knew you." But he did not specifically describe what happened when the Jewish serpent-egg, calling itself "Christianity," was hatched in the throne room of the Roman Empire. The son of man was not lifted up to replace and eternally invalidate the serpent that Moses lifted up in the wilderness. The Catholic Church lifted up the son of man in an effort to confirm that the way of the serpent was "holy." The coin

of the new "Christian" Roman Empire was never minted; but if it had been honestly presented, it would have had, on one side, Jesus hanging on the cross, and, on the other, the serpent lifted up by Moses.

The Pope, and priests whose "authority" derived from the Pope's words, became the new universal serpent makers. Taking as their model the Jewish successes as recited in the Old Testament — they were careful to hide their intentions. They were careful not to show both sides of the new "Christianity" at the same time.

The Roman Emperor had depended on a German guard for centuries and knew that, in the area called Germany, was a power unequalled anywhere else. However, he knew there could be no frontal attack by an army. And he knew that the Germans were not easily fooled. They recognized all the old shapes of the word controlled semi-organisms — the dragon, the serpent, the worm, the giant, even the lone individual posing as a harmless toad. They would fight any encroachment on their individual sovereignty that they recognized. If the Germans were to be made a part of the universal serpent, it would have to be presented to them in a new masquerade that they would not recognize. Jesus, as presented in the kindly words of clever priests, was the form of the Church-serpent's masquerade.

The teachings of Jesus were, of course, seen by the Germans as simply the revered and carefully perpetuated German ideas put into different words. The Germans, like the Greeks, could accept Jesus with full understanding. To them, the story of Jesus was the story of a stranger in a strange land — a stranger advocating German ideals to those who ridiculed, spit upon, and crucified him. And Jesus had died at the hands of these non-understanding people as bravely as any good German could hope to die.

Subsequent followers of Jesus had also been known to face death with similar bravery. It is no surprise that Germans were easily enlisted in the armies of those who would fight on the side of Jesus and his followers against those who opposed and crucified them.

The Franks, listened to the words of the priests. Then the Franks, overran, and took command of the Celts. The Celts had replaced their own gods and druids with the pantheon of Roman gods that had come along with Roman civilization. The multiple-god religion had been one of the customs forced upon them by the armies of the Caesars before the Roman Empire became an Empire controlled by the Pope. The Celts were already accustomed to changing gods. More important they were accustomed to the ways of the serpents — and had come to accept serpent ways as part of

"civilization."

The Franks uprooted the outmoded Roman pantheon in favor of what the Pope called "Christianity;" they stopped the spread of Islam at the Pyrenees; they even went into Spain and destroyed some of those who were spreading Islam over that area. Spain soon became part of the Catholic serpent.

The Pope, however, knew that the real power of Europe was in the heartland of Germany, where the Angles, Saxons, Scandinavians, and other German tribes lived with nature, and had no group-gods, simply to be overthrown and replaced by new ones. These people had never recognized any word orders that an individual would obey, if he had not voluntarily agreed to do so — and voluntarily meant while he was fully armed and had the option of defending the voice in the depths of his being in a fair fight. These people readily accepted the simple story of Jesus. But even the cleverest and most personable priests were having trouble getting most of them to accept the Pope's "authoritative" misinterpretations of the words of Jesus. The opposition to Catholic "Christianity" was that the Germans could accept one side of the coin but not the other.

The Pope sought a strategy for harnessing the enormous power in these people. He looked for a weakness that he could manipulate. He found it. He found a German king committed to the basic morality advocated by Jesus, and ready to promote it — with a fervor that might cloud perception.

The Frankish king, who was helping to create the Roman-"Christian"-serpent, was Charlemagne. We lack full knowledge of Charlemagne's thought patterns but the Pope (obviously using different words from these that present spirit more accurately than bare facts) took him to a high place and pointed out the entire area over which he had command. Then he pointed also to the area of Germany, where the people were unimpressed by mere words. In effect, the Pope said to Charlemagne, "All this will I give you, if you will fall down and worship the Catholic Church and its god, from whom I have absolute authority over the entire earth." Charlemagne was ready to fight for Jesus, but he lacked the wisdom that Jesus had shown in a similar circumstance. Charlemagne fell on his knees, and was crowned "King by the grace of god" over the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation." It was nothing but words.

As a battle leader, Charlemagne had so much on his mind that he had no time for any knowledge of Christianity but the simple picture of Jesus — who no good German would hesitate to advocate

and defend. But those who took time to go into the teachings of the Church more fully glimpsed the flip side of the coin. For the direction of their lives, they were given the priest's version of the Ten Commandments of Moses and other "authorized" misinterpretations of the "words of god."

Most of the basic Ten Commandments seemed merely a statement of German thought and custom. The first three were axiomatic if the word "god" was interpreted as meaning the creative intelligence of the universe, instead of the group-god of the Jews. The priest gave that misinterpretation. The fourth, with regard to resting on the Sabbath, was meaningless to a non-slave people; but there was no objection. Honoring father and mother, whether or not worthy of honor, was hard to swallow, but it was largely academic; those unworthy of honor had long ago been bred out by the use of the sword. "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet" were meaningless among people who had no land ownership, built no elaborate houses, and measured a man's stature by his heroism, not by his possessions. As translated into the thought patterns of the Germans "Thou shalt not commit adultery" and "Thou shalt not bear false witness" were axiomatic. But "Thou shalt not kill" was obviously ridiculous. Not to kill would upset the evolution of heroes, and the world would become cluttered with dastards and underhanded schemers. Mohammed had recognized immediately, and Moses had recognized as soon as the Jews were outside Egypt, where there might be some question regarding which Jews should be killed, that killing was the basic point in creating a serpent. To create a serpent, the power over life and death had to be tied to a word-trigger — killing had to be ordered by an "authority." It was on this point that the Germans balked at accepting the other side of the coin. When told that, not the holy spirit within them, but the voice of the Church speaking in words would decide who should live and who should die, they rejected a "Christianity" that had such a provision.

On the initial attempt to make people accept a commandment "Thou shalt not kill" (EXCEPT when ordered to kill by words from an "authority") Moses ordered 3,000 killed. On his first attempt to impose the same "Thou shalt not kill" commandment on the Saxons, Charlemagne had 20,000 killed. But that was only the beginning. Such mass killings went on for centuries.

Warriors killing warriors, who refused to abdicate their individual sovereignty, was not the worst part of the killing. And that sort of killing would never have created the Catholic serpent. The power of the serpent is based on word control. Establishing word

control takes time; but the Church was carefully organized to destroy old ideals by gradual perversion.

The hilt of every sword was made into a cross; Jesus was made into a group-god. Fair fight was made into a ridiculous exhibition of two men dueling, while a priest stood by blessing the fight with a prayer "God protect the right." Knights, appointed by an "authority," became a special class, having conspicuous prestige by reason of words spoken by an "authority," and wearing such elaborate armor that they required servants to attend them.

Still worse was to come.

After a few centuries, during which leaders, holding a position of king, duke, mayor, et cetera, "by the grace of god," killed off everyone who would not accept a commandment "Thou shalt not kill" (EXCEPT when ordered to kill by words from an "authority") word control had become sufficiently effective for the priests to make that control absolute.

The priests developed systems for dramatically demonstrating that the Church alone held the keys to what would be bound and loosed. The Church now claimed to have such keys not only from Jesus, via Peter, but also from the holy spirit.

The Church set out to control the innermost thoughts of every individual. The priests interpreted the holy spirit as a sort of vague third part of a three part complex — god, son, and holy spirit. The kingdom of god and the whole complex was presented as something external; nothing came from within the depths of one's being. Obedience to the holy spirit was presented to the people as obedience to words written in a book and interpreted by those having "authority" to interpret. Babies were required to be baptized as "parts" of the growing Church-serpent as soon as born. Church schools were set up to teach children what words must replace their innate thoughts. The spirit within any individual who questioned the words and thoughts "authorized" by the Church was branded "an evil spirit."

After a few generations, most people dared not have a thought that had not come to them in "authorized" words. Other thoughts were called superstitious "heresy."

Contrary to the teachings of Jesus, who declared that transgression against the holy spirit within the individual, and that only, could result in damnation, Catholic "Christianity" declared that the "heresy" of listening to that inner voice was the one unforgivable sin.

All were taught that it was "sinful" not to report any suspicion of such "heresy" and, based on suspicion, the priests held inquisi-

tions for the accused. Those who defended the suspected heretic were, for that reason, also deemed heretics.

Torture to gain confession was unbelievably cruel. Punishments were usually public burnings as warnings to others. But the most burning punishment was the confusion of tortured thoughts in the minds of the living — those who really believed the words of the priests.

By the time America was discovered, the power of this sort of "Christianity" was so great that no one even thought of listening to a holy spirit within. No one dared think of anything except how to interpret the words of the Bible — a Christian Bible and a Jewish Bible in diametrical opposition, all combined into one book — and presented as words that overruled the holy spirit within.

The entire world of Europe, England, and Scandinavia was a literal hell, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Mark 9:48.

THE FIRST BREAKING APART OF THE CHURCH SERPENT

In the early part of the sixteenth century the "authority" of the Pope was challenged and broken in two places. Henry VIII of England defied the Pope, broke away from the Church of Rome, and set up a separate Church of England. Martin Luther, in the heartland of ancient Germany, defied the Pope, and set up a following of those who insisted on reading the Bible for themselves. Neither of these breaks resulted in immediate improvement. Perception had already been mutilated almost to total destruction.

It had been centuries since anyone had dared to have a thought that was not words quoted from the self-contradicting Judaeo-Christian Bible, as interpreted by the priest. For sufficient contribution to the church the priest would promise to get the souls of the dead out of purgatory and into heaven, but living individuals had lost their souls. Forced away from their pre-history commitment to individualism, the great majority of all descendants of the Germans and related people had come to think of themselves as "parts" of the Catholic serpent. If some were separated from the "whole," as was now happening, they had been pre-conditioned to look for a new "authority." From the pattern set by the Greek serpent, a faint hint that "civil authority" was different from "church authority" had continued all along. The civil now seemed like a possible path for escaping the tyranny of the churches.

However the civil, as all had been conditioned to think of it, was another serpent, and the distinction was mostly words. It seemed

different only because words had become all important. People had come to live in a world of words; the civil-church word distinction had been perpetuated all along because it was an expedient used to camouflage realities. In the inquisitions, the priests turned the heretics over to civil "authorities" to be burned after the church had called them guilty. Anyone who refused to carry out the church's orders was burned as a heretic; so the church exercised full "authority" over the civil. The civil dared not take other than previously "authorized" routine actions; all significant matters were designated "religious."

Still something was happening. Without wishing to do so, the church was teaching the "civil authorities" the serpent-making ways as used by the church. The subordinate civil administrators, holding their positions only "by the grace of god," became serpent makers themselves. They began maneuvering against popes and priests. They had learned the serpent way so thoroughly that it seemed the only way. Sometimes the state serpent became dominate over the church serpent.

What was now happening was simply that the universal church serpent had begun to divide and become civil and church, civil and civil, church and church. The distinctions were not significant. All were similar centers of "authority" over individuals who had been word-conditioned. Individuals had come to think of themselves as "parts" of some semi-organism. Whatever the source of "authority," all individuals now required words to direct their actions. The way of serpents had become the only way of life. All resistance to the serpent way had been fully destroyed.

Those in positions of "authority" had come to like the power and false prestige that went with simply using words to control a semi-organism. And the cell-like "parts," called "citizens" in the state serpent, had come to look for an "authority" — for something outside themselves to "preserve order." They had been brainwashed by priests to denounce the three billion year old order of the universe as immoral.

Among these brainwashed people, there was no revolt against the serpent-pseudo-morality, no revolt against the false morality that the individual should be subordinated to the "good of the group." There was no longer any thought of individual sovereignty. Speaking Biblical language, the serpent had been held up instead of the son of man. Speaking German traditions, no one now thought of fighting the dragon.

Even as words had taken over thought, new meanings for words had taken over old meanings, and changed stories had taken over

the old remembered stories. Some of the "authorized" interpretations often destroyed or completely reversed the meaning of ancient words. The church that had decreed an individual's reverence for the holy spirit within oneself was "heresy," had also made the Jewish advocacy of serpent ways a part of the "Christian" Bible and taught people that the ways of the serpent were "holy." This had required abandoning the use of the word "serpent" as a symbol for "body politic" and giving new interpretations of the word in various passages of the Bible. In places it meant interpreting "serpent" as referring to a strangely magical biological reptile but, where necessary, even that had been done.

Also the word "dragon" had been dealt with so as to effectively destroy the meaning of the word, itself, along with the thought pattern which had been associated with that meaning. The hypocritical method that had been used for doing this is now familiar because everyone now knows the story of Joan of Arc, whom the church had burned for sorcery in 1431 and then made into a saint in 1920. The similar dragon story, which follows, is less familiar and will stand retelling, because it includes the total reversal of a word meaning.

About three hundred years after Jesus there were a hundred or more groups, all calling themselves "Christian," who were strongly opposing each other. Some of these groups — including the one that became the Catholic Church — were turning the words of Jesus into a serpent-making religion, and competing with each other for the Emperor's approval. Others were fighting against such corruption of Christianity — fighting against serpents or dragons no matter what their facade. Among these was a soldier named George, who was strongly Christian. George gained a wide reputation as the "Dragon Slayer." In 303 AD he was captured, tortured, and killed by the Emperor Diocletian. After the details on which George's reputation rested had been thoroughly twisted or obscured, the Catholic Church, which had become the "authorized Christian Church," led peoples to believe that all early Christians, including George, had been Catholic. It then gave out the "authorized" interpretation that "dragon" meant "the evil that opposes the church." Since it would have been "heresy" to insist on the original meaning of dragon, the church simply claimed a folk hero; it made George into "Saint George the Dragon Slayer." In time, word conditioned people forgot that real flesh-and-blood soldiers never fight against fairy tale dragons or abstracts. When words can twist how conditioned people see realities, it is no problem to twist how they see words.

The people, who could now read the Bible for themselves, had been fully pre-conditioned to misinterpret it. The teachings of Jesus, that had been readily accepted as being in full agreement with the people's Saxon-forest-heritage, had been deprived of their clear meaning. Any clarified understanding would now have to come from within.

But the inquisitions had done their work. Very few now remained who, with any confidence, could accept the holy spirit within themselves.

A FURTHER BREAK FROM THE SERPENT

A century after King Henry VIII and Martin Luther had made successful breaks from the "authority" of the Pope, many new religious sects developed, but the matters on which they differed from the Catholic Church did not go to the heart of things; none dared make the necessary break between the New Testament, upholding the son of man, and the Old Testament, upholding the serpent. Like the Catholic Church, the new sects were serpent-making groups, each jealous of other serpent-making groups, and each controlled by a leader, giving an "authoritative" interpretation of the self-contradicting Bible for the direction of the group.

Some of these people began to seek a new life in America, where the native Indians, although lacking the conscious commitment to individual sovereignty that the colonist's ancestors had known in the Saxon forests, were fairly close to the holy spirit within themselves; at least no deliberately organized word-conditioning was separating them from natural reality. Certainly the Indians were in much closer touch with the spirit within them than were the northern European immigrants. These immigrants, who were our ancestors, were just beginning to look for a way back through the word labyrinth laid down by centuries of the thought conditioning to which they had been subjected. The effectiveness of that conditioning was glaringly evident in their actions. No longer remembering what had been done to their own ancestors, they did substantially the same thing to the native Indians.

To dwell on how the word-conditioned northern Europeans now tried to impose their own conditioning on the native Indians would simply be to retell a story very similar to the European version. The main difference was this: The Romans had recognized the German tribes as the greatest power in Europe. The invading colonists saw the Indian tribes as being a much lesser power than the invaders, themselves. They felt that trying to make use of the Indians would be more trouble than destroying them. So the "civilized" butcher-

ing of "barbarians," who would not accept a commandment "Thou shalt not kill" (EXCEPT when ordered to do so by an "authority"), was so similar to what had happened to their own ancestors in Europe that no significant new aspects developed. The colonist's lack of perception would be an almost unbelievable thing to contemplate, if the same lack of perception did not still exist in plentiful evidence. They were destroying in others the very thing they were floundering to rediscover in themselves — when they could, instead, have relearned from the Indians something about the holy spirit which in themselves had, for many generations, been buried under the words of priests.

Even while they were killing the Indians, an unrecognized help for them was being provided by those they were killing. Because the Indians had always treated it with reverence, the natural world in America was still in harmony with the universal creative intelligence. It was this that helped the colonists recover their bearings.

The voice within themselves had been silenced, but the voice of manifest reality spoke with the same clear, profound eloquence that humans had listened to before human words had drowned out its message — before words had become all that held their attention and filled their thoughts. The colonists from Europe, like people removed from an insane asylum and set down in a natural wilderness, began to show the human animal's recuperative powers. During the first hundred and fifty years there were some indications that the contact with nature might fit them to lead the whole human species back to sanity.

One of the first significant advances was made by Roger Williams. As a perceptive individual, Williams demonstrated the meaning of the symbolic keys given Peter by Jesus; he declared that every individual's view about the universal creative intelligence was a matter of conscience. He proclaimed that no one could have any position of "authority" over what another "should" believe. He established the first Baptist church within the area that was later to be designated the United States.

Each individual Baptist church was conceived as being composed simply of those with like beliefs who voluntarily came together; the church had no "authority" over its individual members; the pastor of each had no "authority"; he was chosen and/or "ordained" by those who wanted him to conduct the services; there was no infant baptism; membership in the church was a voluntary decision of those old enough to think for themselves and make their own decisions. This would become the non-Catholic church that was chosen

by the greatest number of people in what would be called the United States — first, those descended from the tribes of Germany, and later, also, those descended from the tribes of Africa.

Sometime later, in the British Isles, John Wesley would start a society advocating similar freedom of individual conscience. The Wesleyan society would evolve into what would be called the Methodist church, with the second largest non-Catholic membership in the area called the United States.

Roger William's declaration stands as the first monument, marking the way back to individual sovereignty. He proclaimed again the eternal truth that nothing must be allowed to overrule the holy spirit of the universal creative intelligence in each individual.

The next monument to the sacredness of individual integrity was set by Thomas Jefferson about a hundred years later. In the Declaration of Independence, he proclaimed the individual's freedom of action. He proclaimed it to be self-evident that all are created free and equal (all are born sovereign individuals) and that it is the right, and duty, of individuals to alter or abolish any government that ceases to promote every individual's innate freedom.

Unlike the Jews, who for three thousand years had been celebrating with pride their serpent-making skills as displayed in Egypt — and, unlike the officials of the Catholic Church, who rose to positions of power by demonstrating their skills in serpent making — most of the colonists had no more comprehension of the ways of serpent makers than the American Indians. For a thousand years they had been nothing but pawns in the hands of organized manipulators. Even the basic words by which they had once communicated their thoughts had been mutilated and made meaningless. Their "mythology" had been either twisted backwards or fully destroyed. They no longer consciously recognized that the basis of all tyranny is word control. They no longer recognized that the power of a tyrannical king is always based on a word-controlled potential mob. They no longer even had a clearly understood descriptive word for the word-controlled semi-organism that tyrannizes over individuals.

But they did recognize the ultimate product of word control when it had become active tyranny. They rallied against a clear and present tyranny, and broke away from their European ties.

Then, floundering away from a tyranny that they did recognize, they set up a civil semi-organism, after the Greek model, with the same illusions that the Greeks had never dispelled. However, it contained one highly significant improvement.

Like the freedom of conscience declared by Roger Williams, and like the freedom of action declared by Jefferson, the Constitution of the United States became a clear monument to individual sovereignty when the Bill of Rights was attached to it. The Bill of Rights protected individuals from the government, itself — from the serpent.

Roger Williams and Thomas Jefferson had set up the highest monuments to the worth of the individual since the life, death, and teachings of Jesus. The colonists had shown their understanding, they had accepted the monuments as marking the path they were groping for, and, by insisting that the Bill of Rights be attached to the Constitution, they had set up another monument — one that said to the serpent: "This far shall you go and no farther." By doing this, they showed that their heritage from the Saxon forest was still not entirely destroyed; a trace of the word-mutilated thought and behavior pattern still persisted.

The resurfacing of these long-buried thought patterns enabled them to hear the word-overruled voice of the holy spirit within themselves clearly enough to choose the Jesus side of the coin the priests had passed on to them — and to become at least a little suspicious of the side with the serpent on it. Thomas Jefferson was so clear on his position that he wanted to go farther than cutting the Old Testament away from the teachings of Jesus; he saw the writings of Paul as a corrupting influence; he wanted to detach them and let the teachings of Jesus stand alone in their full, uncon-fused significance.

THE STRANGE PHENOMENON OF "MONEY-MAD" AMERICANS

When, two or three centuries ago, men like Roger Williams and Thomas Jefferson were not being tortured and killed by serpent makers — when, instead, they were being cheered by millions, it might be expected that Americans had clearly taken the road toward individualism, and the way of the serpent would be discarded by now. Not so.

No new monuments have been set. The first three monuments, marking the way to individualism, stand on paths that have ceased to be used. The revered memory of them is subjected to the degradation of hypocritical oratory by serpent makers, who try to use them as instruments of word control. Such serpent makers have always tried to make use of everything the people cherished. It is their way. It is to be expected. The strange thing is that millions of people who are repulsed by the condition have tolerated it. That

puzzle has to have an answer.

There had been cheering for the words of Williams and Jefferson, but the Saxon forest sounds of individual sovereigns clanging swords against shields to approve proposed action seemed far off to those who only cheered brave words with empty hands. For too many centuries they had been conditioned to think of themselves as "parts" of a word controlled group. Most of them would no longer have been sufficiently in tune with the holy spirit within themselves to have acted wisely as sovereign individuals, even if they had thought it was desirable. The labyrinth of word conditioning would need to be examined before it could be known well enough to be removed, before remembered words no longer stopped the voice within from coming through in full clarity. But time did not allow for full examination. In America things moved too fast.

Even before the old was removed, a new labyrinth of word control was being thrown up. A bureaucratic serpent — a sort of Frankenstein monster — would replace the word control of the Catholic serpent.

From the very beginning, new serpent makers began to take over the civil government called the United States. The old Greek system of government, giving a few in elected positions the "authority" to make laws binding on everyone else, was an open invitation for serpent makers to seek those positions. They got them. They made laws in such profusion that individuals became bogged down in the "legal" morass. Individuals even had to depend on "authorities" to interpret the confused word garbage called "law." Tocqueville pointed out that tyranny was equally oppressive whether the tyrannical yoke being placed on the individual was held out by a lone monarch or the million hands of a majority. Yet the people did not revolt.

If two hundred years ago, circumstances had required the colonists to face the problem they had created, it might have been easily solved; the serpent had not grown to monstrous size. At that time it would have been necessary only to make unmistakably clear the command to the serpent: This far you go and no farther. But it was left alone and allowed to grow.

The new breed of serpent makers were inexperienced. At first, they were very cautious. The tyranny of the word-manipulated majority was slow in developing. Also there were two things which distracted the people's attention from what was happening: (1) Open land, and, (2) an illusion regarding the function of money that required more careful examination than eager pioneers had time for.

The most easily understandable distraction was open land. If one did not like what was happening, he could "go west." In the expanse of forest, rivers, broad plains, and mountains — all having only a few scattered humans — one could feel a direct relationship being rebuilt between oneself and the total universe. One could even become lonely for, seek, and love one's neighbors. In that expanse of undisturbed nature one could believe that he truly lived in a land of the free and a home of the brave.

Money, which contained the other distraction, is a difficult thing to talk about with any clarity. The very word "money" is almost as difficult to use as the word "god." Like the meaning of the word "god," the meaning of the word "money" has also been deliberately distorted by serpent makers.

Because "money," the word itself, is not considered sacred, as the very word "god" is considered sacred by millions of people, much discussion has gone on regarding the point where money ceases to be a medium of exchange — where it becomes something radically different. The word "capital" suggests money that is not a simple medium of exchange, but that word has been given various confused and confusing definitions — and has been used with emotional connotations by serpent makers, who combine the term "capitalistic society" with a tirade of shibboleths and meaningless jargon. The word "capital" continues to have meaning in the sense that it is used by accountants; otherwise it cannot be used for intelligent discussion.

Because money that functions as a medium of exchange is physically indistinguishable from money that is not a simple medium of exchange, I prefer to use the one word when talking of money's two different aspects. However, I will try to distinguish the aspects by using modifiers.

Money is a physical thing, usually a piece of paper, that represents a measurable quantity of: (1) Some specific tangible thing having intrinsic value, or (2) the power to commandeer, by taxation, tangible things having intrinsic value.

The power to commandeer ties money to the way of the serpent — to "authority." The two aspects of money are indistinguishable in money as a physical thing. The physical money is an order, generally accepted at face value when presented by any anonymous bearer. The anonymity of the bearer is a highly significant factor.

As most people deal with it, money is a simple medium of exchange. It saves moving bulky items around for barter, and it can be used to get work performed or have services rendered without considering the specific items involved in the barter.

Money — that is physically indistinguishable from that used as a medium of exchange — can be measurable quantity of a serpent's word-created "authority." Because the physical money has no obvious connection to word-control, it provides a method for secretly using an existing serpent's power without the purpose or results being identified with the manipulator.

Money secretly used to control or promote recognized serpents (including the enemies of those whose "tax-money" is being used), money used to create new serpents in secret, or money secretly used to promote obscure existing ones until they suddenly show their power — these are the "authority" aspects of money that concern us. Money is no longer a simple medium of exchange when it is secretly combined with serpent practices — when it has an under-cover connection with word control.

Money, which is openly identified with the "authority" using it, is a simple medium of exchange. The Roman Emperor depended on German soldiers — called mercenaries — who were paid with money. All nation-states pay their soldiers and call them "professionals." It is not this open use of paid soldiers, whatever they are called, that is the use of money as "authority." The out-in-the-open "authority" dominates the "authority" of money to the point where the "authority" aspect of money is insignificant.

When military organizations are visible, "authority" is clearly defined, carefully measured, and identified with its source. The stripes of a corporal or sergeant, the bars of a lieutenant or captain, the eagle of a colonel, and the stars of a general are openly displayed measures of "authority." When the military organization is visible, the ultimate source of "authority" is the identified serpent having word control. It can be seen and judged as a thing out in the open.

Measured amounts of money can become the camouflaged emblems of "authority" for a secret detachment of "soldiers" who wear no identifying uniforms. Money can replace openly displayed stripes, bars, eagles and stars with hundreds, thousands, millions, billions of dollars that are never seen. Or, if the physical money is seen, the "authority" is still camouflaged, because the money is the same physical thing that is used as a simple medium of exchange.

Nation-states allow no one with great quantities of money openly to maintain a private army. However serpents, organized on the "authority" of money, can infiltrate, exist within, or completely take over, an openly identified semi-organism. The existence of some of these is known; others are created and operate in total secrecy, or fully camouflaged by a facade that appears harmless.

In the minds of present day American people, the "Mafia" is such a hidden serpent. Whether it actually exists or does not exist and, if it does exist, how big and powerful it may be, is not a point to dwell on here. For the purpose of example, it is enough that the "Mafia" is a commonly held idea. The Mafia-idea illustrates the fact that money makes possible an unseen serpent of enormous power.

However, the most dangerous unseen serpents operate under some "legal" facade. Under such a facade, they easily tie in with direct word control, and the line between "legal" and "not legal" becomes a constantly shifting one. The unseen serpent-makers use the "authority" of money to turn "legal" into "not legal" — and "not legal" into "legal." As used by already existing serpents operating under cover, or by the makers of new serpents, the "authority" of money not only defeats law enforcement, it makes laws and removes laws.

"Laws" were originally thought of as coming from a group-god. Jesus condemned the elaborate laws, and the hair-splitting law interpretations that characterized the Jews. He chose to do this without giving them sufficient reasons to crucify him, until he decided that the time was right. The Jews, who have always known and used the serpent-making aspect of money, tried to get Jesus to tangle himself up in a discussion of money as "authority," but he avoided their efforts in that direction. One of his followers did say that "the love of money is the root of all evil." 1 Timothy 6:10. But Timothy did not elaborate on the "evil" of money; he just implied that it was a distraction. He seems to have been concerned with the distracting products of "civilization" for which money can be exchanged, not with the distraction in money itself.

In America there was, and still is, a distraction in money, itself. This distraction results from failure to examine closely the "authority" aspect of money. It is obvious that hundreds, thousands, millions, billions of dollars can function as the stripes, bars, eagles, and stars of a secret army. It, therefore, seems logical to assume that enough money can function as sovereignty. The question that busy pioneers did not have time to fully examine was: What kind of sovereignty?

The descendants of the northern Europeans who settled America were trying to get away from the "government" — from a synthetic group-sovereignty. Some simply went "out west." Others had the illusion that they could regain their individual sovereignty through money — gold, land, or whatever. They chased money with the illusion that enough money could have a value — other

than a medium of exchange — that it cannot have.

Freedom cannot be bought by money that is a medium of exchange. And individual freedom is something which money as "authority" cannot insure. Money as "authority" is useful only for secret serpent making. The illusion that its "authority" could bring individual freedom was a distraction that blinded many to what the serpent makers were doing. Many hugged the pleasant illusion that building an individual fortune was regaining individual sovereignty. Hugging that illusion, they failed to look at what was happening to themselves, who were successfully piling up "wealth," as well as to everyone else.

We still have a long way to go before we regain the wisdom that was buried along with our ancient "dragon mythology."

Our ancestors, the early northern Europeans, refused to use money. We do not know whether they remembered from past experiences their reasons for this or were just following an ancient taboo; we simply know the facts are true. The "taboo" was known to have existed in Europe in prehistory times.

Lycurgus, the real or fictional first ruler of the Greeks, insisted that money be made of bulky material for two reasons: (1) No one would want to accumulate much of it; and, (2) it could not be moved about without the movement becoming conspicuous. This prehistory European attitude toward money has come down to us in detail through the writings of Plutarch.

When clearly seen, when one is not hugging a pleasant illusion, the "authority" aspect of money is "loved" only by serpent makers — legal, illegal, church, or civil.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

Money beyond one's needs can be used to make more money. Most of those, who were following the illusion that making money was regaining individual freedom, used their excess money to make still more, to aid their families or friends, or to help what they called "worthwhile charities." This "good" use of money inadvertently served as a smoke screen for the use of money as "authority" by serpent makers. At least it served as a smoke screen for those close enough to be impressed by this "good" use.

Those outside the United States, looking at the "moat" in their brother's eye, while a "beam" was in their own, saw the people of the United States pursuing money with what appeared to be a frantic, single-minded purpose. Great expanses of land and mineral wealth were up for grabs and the activity was unquestionably frantic. From distant shores, it was difficult to distinguish between: (1)

Those trying to get away from the serpent, (2) those chasing money with the illusion that it could restore individual freedom, and (3) those reaching for the serpent-making "authority" that exists in money.

The initial semi-organism of the United States was created by those with a tradition of individual freedom, but for a thousand years the Catholic Church had been brainwashing them to submit to church "authority." The pseudo-morality of groupism had been forced upon them by the inquisitions. Without taking time to explore the basis for the church-imposed pseudo-morality, they merely reacted to church dominance by following the Greek example of creating a clearly man-made civil "authority." Initially synthesizing "law" from a conglomerate of human "wills," they left the way open for unlimited additional laws. Such a semi-organism is not only open to elected serpent-makers; it is also wide open to control by hidden serpents or secret serpent makers using money as "authority."

"Pork-barrel politics" — the appropriation of money accumulated by general taxation in a way that will buy votes — was conspicuous from a very early time. Legislators, who participated in "money authority" schemes — that were much less conspicuous than standard pork-barrel politics — made so many laws, to favor so many undercover interests, that money to hire lawyers, or whole groups of lawyers, soon became the biggest factor in "legal" contests. It could win the contest or cause an indefinite delay that was tantamount to winning. Unscrupulous schemers had an open field to twist existing laws or simply pay to have new laws made as they wanted them.

As competition among secret interests stiffened, serpent makers began moving into direct word control. Ostentatiously displaying a facade of aid to "free enterprise," advertising "agencies" evolved advertising into a highly sophisticated "discipline" of word-control, with the control often coming from camouflaged, or totally hidden sources. Politicians and bureaucracies became proficient in publicly proclaiming one thing, while promoting its opposite with tax money, and with complicated laws, carefully designed to confuse. Conspicuous examples are almost infinite. Their great number effectively serves to distract attention from, and to divide opposition to, the system, itself.

To avoid distracting attention from the fact that the system, itself, is the problem, I want to cite no more details than necessary to serve as examples of word manipulation. The word "freedom" originally meant freedom to act, but the group's increased power

over individuals is praised as providing individuals with freedom from want, freedom from fear, et cetera, even while new restrictive laws, or new interpretations of old laws, are depriving the individual of freedom to act for himself. A cabinet post, ostensibly established to promote construction of housing, is used to prevent individuals, and builders with the "wrong politics," from building "non-standard" housing — when "non-standard" is, of course, a term subject to arbitrary interpretation by the bureaucracies having "authority." In the name of aid to small businesses, a Small Business Bureau helps to selectively destroy small businesses by tangling them in red tape. A tax-supported National Endowment for the Arts propagandizes in favor of artistic freedom, while it secretly promotes control over art by those in government "positions." A branch of it, set up to aid small book publishers and small magazines, is used to discredit and help put some of them out of business. In the name of free speech and free press, the serpent-making "authority" of money, itself, is given a voice loud enough to drown out the voice of every ordinary individual. Hypocritical proclamations on national television networks — praising freedom of speech — drown out individual voices, and promote a system that requires millions of dollars to elect a candidate to a "position of authority," or to contest unconstitutional laws enforced by bureaucrats.

The undercover use of money as "authority" has now become a standard American way of life. A great number of fully functioning or embryonic undercover serpents, using money as "authority," are now competing for control of the United States. Newspapers, magazines, book publishing, movie-making, radio, and television are often chosen as their "legal" facades. These choices serve the undercover serpent-makers in two ways: (1) They provide the "legal" facades. (2) They give direct word control into the hands of the hidden serpents. Schools and colleges are the basic tools of word control over which undercover serpents, using money, compete for surreptitious dominance. Money as "authority" has become so fully accepted in the United States that the distinction between "legal" and "not legal" has virtually disappeared.

Insane asylums are sometimes called snake pits. The term is appropriate. Individual insanity is the result of living in this sort of breeding ground for the group-semi-organisms called serpents. As long as there was sparsely settled land, those who came to America seeking to regain their individual sovereignty, kept pushing across the continent, in an attempt to keep ahead of the fast-following ser-

pent culture.

Before the continent was fully settled, what they were looking for had emerged as an ideal of heroic stature — heroic but hazy. It was that of the lone cowboy walking with slow, watchful, nerve-ready alertness into an unscrupulous gang of underhanded schemers, commonly called "sidewinders." There was a gun on his hip, and a will of his own was evident in his steady eyes. The whole world saw and admired. Everywhere the image awakened a long forgotten self. It was the American dream of freedom and human integrity personified. But the meaning of the heroic figure never reached full consciousness. The dream figure, born from the subconsciously remembered heritage of individual sovereignty, is now only twenty-one inches high on a big screen television.

THE GERMAN REICH

Money, as evolved from word control, and as a tool of word control, distracts attention from basic reality. In the basic contest, whether between serpents and serpents, or between serpents and sovereign individuals, money is not a power of itself. The individual human will is the basic power. The way of the serpent is to confuse that will, so as to make it subject to manipulation by words from an "authority."

History as ordinarily written is the history of serpents, of nations, of fictitious entities. This is a different kind of history. The natural person, the basic source of human will, and the manipulation of that will, is human history as we are now looking at it.

For untold centuries, the ancestors of the American colonists — the German tribes of northern Europe — had consciously opposed the way of the dragon or serpent. They were never overcome by a force outside themselves; they were tricked by clever priests into letting a camouflaged version of the serpent into their own thoughts. The verbal-serpent-eggs grew to produce serpents.

The snake-pit developed other serpents than the Catholic Church. Gradually overthrowing the word-control exercised by the Pope, the German tribes in most areas formed state-serpents — Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, the United States, Canada, et cetera.

The last hold out was in the original heartland of the German tribes — roughly the area that is now called Germany. There the people resisted the control of each person's individual will by the "authority" of words to the last. When they could no longer hope to survive as individuals, they formed small local semi-organisms. The Church tried to mold these into a single unit, but, before the

job was fully accomplished, the "Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation" became a name without "authority."

The cities insisted on local autonomy. Autonomous agricultural groups were formed around fortified castles. Small military groups protected local areas resisting amalgamation. Well into the eighteenth century there were over seventeen hundred independent units. The United States had broken away from England, been divided by civil war, and subsequently reunited, before the independent units in the heartland of ancient Germany — holding out for local autonomy as the next best thing to individualism — were finally united into a single semi-organism — the Reich.

The word "Reich" is significant. Unquestionably the semi-organism was the same sort of serpent or dragon against which Beowulf and Siegfried of legend had tried to offer an individual's defense — as the steady-eyed American cowboy had tried to stand against gangs that to him seemed evil. But "Reich" carried a cargo of connotations.

Literally "Reich" simply translates into English as "rich." But the richness is not that of money. It is the memory of life in the forests, when coins were valued only for the engraved horse-drawn chariot on the mint stamp, and a goblet of gold was valued no higher than a good earthen vessel. Then there had been no law but the holy spirit within the individual. When the Hebrew commandment, against taking what Hebrew law said belonged to another, was imposed on the Germans by the priests, it could not be translated into the language of a people who had no property laws. It was translated: Thou shalt not steal — take by stealth.

Stealth in human relations the Germans abhored. "Blood and iron" was the phrase used to designate the open, above-board opposition to unscrupulous schemers, that traditionally had bred out underhanded dastards, and created the rich life, where only those who loved their neighbors as themselves survived. Those who survived also shared a love of all nature equal to, or even greater than, love of human neighbors. Communion with nature had been to them communion with the creative intelligence of the universe. The priests had confused them and they fumbled for a new clarity.

"Blood and iron" was the slogan of Bismarck, who brought together those who wanted to protect their richly remembered past — their Reich. To those for whom it recalled a time before the concept of ownership was introduced, Reich, although sometimes translated as "realm," spoke with more emotional power than could ever be suggested by "my own, my native land." "Reich" signified values that could no longer be expressed in any words or

stories still available to the people.

But in Germany, as in America, there were some who preferred to use underhanded methods to gain power over the wills of individuals — to manipulate people without bringing their ultimate objectives into the open.

Concurrently with Bismarck's efforts to bring this last hold-out for local autonomy into a single power, there was another will at work in the same area. There was a Jew named Karl Marx, who had other plans for the Germans among whom he was born. Marx had other than German memories, and these other memories had been kept fresh by the Feast of the Passover, memories of workers poisoning the Pharaoh's cattle and then, after clever undercover planning, poisoning the first born in every Egyptian household. He wanted to gain power by inciting one portion of the Germans to sabotage the efforts of another portion, as Moses had turned the Jews against the Egyptians. But there was a problem.

The German agricultural workers, or serfs, did not hate the prince in the castle who protected them; they had a rich tradition of a leader rising in an open assembly and asking who would follow him in a needed fight. They saw their prince as an admirable leader. The same problem existed elsewhere. In the independent cities, the workmen formed guilds and were proud of their craftsmanship. The guild emblems were crafted of beautifully wrought metal to display the workers' pride. The craftsmen were not a people of slave temperament hating a Pharaoh's power because they had no concept of leadership. It was their tradition that leaders led only after clearly announcing an objective, and that those who followed did so of their own free will. There was no word-created "position of leadership" — to be coveted because the "position" appeared prestigious. Therefore there was no ready made group of people who thought of themselves as "slaves" hating "masters." Marx set out to change things.

Marx set out to create — by the use of words — the sort of situation celebrated in the Passover Feasts. He gathered around himself a following of workers incited to revolt against the "oppression" of their leaders.

His efforts to sabotage the Reich were quickly discovered. Marx was exiled from the German area and also exiled from France. In London, with the editorial assistance of Friedrich Engels, he wrote The Communist Manifesto. It was a manual for international revolution, in which he called the international Pharaoh-type class the "bourgeoisie," and the international workers, that he wanted to lead as Moses had led the Jews, the "proletariat." He followed

this with another book called *Capital*, in which, by a ridiculous misinterpretation of the meaning of money, he changed the names of the classes he had invented from "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" to "capital" and "labor."

Judaeo-Communism was designed to secretly promote revolution, so that an undercover serpent, following the prototype of the Jews in Egypt, could swallow up all other embryonic serpents emerging during a revolutionary chaos. The pseudo-morality of communism was one hundred percent Jewish: The group would be everything; the individual would be "morally" obligated to submit to the group, "morally" obligated to become a mere "part," having no will other than the "good" of the group as a group. The fact that Judaeo-Communism was diametrically opposed to the connotations of "Reich" can be seen from the language of the Communist Manifesto that speaks of "rescuing" people from the "idiocy of rural life."

It was over twenty years after the publication of the Communist Manifesto before the German Reich came into being in 1871. At that time, the followers of Karl Marx in Germany did not stage an open revolt. However, along with the Catholic Church, they continued to oppose the Reich. They waited for the time of planned chaos that would give them an opportunity to take over.

In Germany before the first world war, there were three clear cut political parties: (1) A slightly modified communist party. (2) A party dominated by the Catholic Church. (3) A party dominated by the military. This third party was trying to preserve traditional individual freedom against the groupism of the communists and the Catholic Church.

The identity of the military and individualism in Germany needs to be understood. Military organization is openly based on suspension of individualism for the duration of a fight and while in preparatory training for a fight. It is formal, carefully-planned action control. This action control differs radically from surreptitious thought control by words. Military action openly states the purpose to be accomplished; after that, action control has no criterion but efficacy in accomplishing the stated purpose.

In Germany, at the time of World War I, the military was supporting the ideal of traditional individual sovereignty against the Catholic Church and against communism. However, the Americans were shown pictures of their German-speaking cousins marching in precise columns and told that these last people to relinquish their individual sovereignty were innately committed to the sort of group-pseudo-morality they were actually fighting. Within

historical times, we all had the same ancestors; but the demagogues loudly proclaimed that the Germans were a peculiar "race" — radically different from freedom loving peoples. The propaganda said that the Germans — as a "race" — had to be beaten into submission "to make the world safe for democracy."

THE WORLD PICTURE AFTER WORLD WAR I

Like the Indian tribes of America, the German tribes, scattered over the world, destroyed their original way of life by their inability to see exactly what was happening — and by fighting each other. The misunderstandings and fights between German-speaking Germans and their Scandinavian and English-speaking cousins, were, of course, intensified when all had accepted the way of serpents. Then the new serpent-makers used words to bury — still more deeply than the Catholic Church had already buried it — the innate-morality-become-custom that had once been the common heritage of all.

The remaining traces of the old thought patterns, which the new serpent-makers could not completely bury, they distorted into division-creating sophistries. During World War I, they wove words about monarchy and democracy into a garbled caricature of the real issue between groupism and individualism. Their purpose of creating a confusion, that could be manipulated into a word-designated division, was fully accomplished.

The real issue has not yet been allowed to surface. It is not between serpent and serpent. It is between all serpents and all humans. All serpent-makers are trying to destroy all individuality. All who want no part in the serpent game are making fumbling attempts to survive as individuals.

In order to give real examples of the two possible directions for word-using humans, to show the two directions at the fork in the road, we contrasted the individual-subordinated-to-the-group pseudo-morality, advocated and practiced by the Jews, to the morality of individual sovereignty, as set forth in the teachings of Jesus and originally practiced by the German tribes. We were looking at diametrically opposing directions and the thought patterns from which they originated. We were looking at direction setting ideas. The view of Germans and Jews as separate races is a word-division advocated by serpent-makers; all of us are individual humans with serpent-makers interspersed among us. Now that the way of the serpent dominates the entire world, let us focus on the more comprehensive picture. Let us focus on all peoples as individual humans.

Humans are moral animals, and morality is the issue that sets direction. The serpent-making pseudo-morality of groupism opposes, not only the teachings of Jesus; it also opposes the direction indicated by the universal creative intelligence in the language of objective reality. Morality, as manifest in objective reality, is clear and uncontestable, but serpent-makers use words to overrule perception and prevent individuals from acknowledging to themselves what they see.

In the world of objective reality we see herd animals — sheep, buffalo, lemmings, et cetera — and the herd practices can be seen as having some survival values that might recommend groupism. These group-survival-values are emphasized by the serpent makers, and presented as evidence in support of their pseudo-morality. If that was all we had to base our judgments on there might be some question. However reality perpetuates a clear history of many blind alleys of evolution; one of these displays the long-range effect of groupism. That one illuminates what might otherwise be questionable. Because it is history written in the pages of extant reality, it cannot be twisted by words. It stands there for all to see — and its meaning is clear.

Certain bees and ants provide the ultimate history of groupism. That history shows that when a group moves toward becoming an organism, then sex — which, among other aspects, obviously functions as a prohibition against groupism — has to be perverted. The mentioned bees and ants have gone all the way — to total groupism. The result is total biological destruction of sex in worker-bees and worker-ants. Individual bees and ants are physically still discrete objects, but they are no longer "parts" — with the word in quotation marks. They are parts that have passed the point of no return. They have actually become biological parts. The semi-organism has become one organism — in full actuality. The parts have become fully dependent on the whole; they cannot survive when separated. The parts, although still discrete objects, function as asexual cells in the group-whole. The group-whole functions as a single asexual organism. The significance of sex has been lost beyond hope of recovery.

The fact that this, unmistakably, is regression — when considering the direction of overall evolution — is clear evidence that the real language of the universal creative intelligence is saying that the pseudo-morality of groupism is immoral.

For people who have an objective, analytical way of thinking, religion has to be derived from objective knowledge. For them, religion must be a concept of the cause, reality, and direction of the

universe, and a conscious attempt to attain harmony with that reality and conform to that direction. The concept must be derived from waking observation. Their morality has to be formed by looking at the long range direction of evolution as its only indisputable criterion. When looking objectively at all living things, morality has to be read as choosing the long range direction being travelled by the advance echelon of evolution; the immoral has to be read as the regressive direction. Total groupism, the ultimate result of what we have been calling "the way of the serpent," opposes the real world's direction. Therefore, the way of the serpent must be called immoral in a religion based on scientific analysis of observed reality.

Groupism, then, is condemned in two ways that have been recited. Jesus pointed out the immorality of groupism by the whole meaning of his life, death, and teachings. And groupism must be viewed as immoral from the long range perspective of manifest reality.

But those who merely look at what immediately surrounds them, and see nothing but the serpent game, are persuaded to accept that game as "the way things are." They dismiss both admonitions — "choose the kingdom of heaven instead of the things of this world" and "choose enduring reality instead of the group-controlling game" — because no conspicuous society is now going in the recommended direction. They accept the game that treats individuals as human clones — and dismiss the admonition that when they function as clones, they are destroying something of great value. Some even try to word-glorify the obvious opposition of "the way things are" to the direction of the universal creative intelligence as manifest in enduring reality; they are nearing the point of no return when they have become word-conditioned to view their attempt to perfect the regressive way of the serpent as an attempt to "achieve victory over nature."

The clear evidence that total groupism totally destroys sex suggests that the tie-in between sex and individualism is highly significant, and examination bears this out. Each supports the other. Without the free expression of individual will there is no deep perception of the differences between sexual temperaments, and no intimate yes-saying between one individual who creates by selective destruction and a radically different one who creates by selecting and cherishing. Without basic sexual perception, the finely tuned but more broadly focused perception that values radically different individuals is also destroyed; it has no impulse to perpetuate and sustain it.

Sex has given the advance echelon of life its balance for 600 million years; but no longer is there a conspicuous human society where sex is still accepted as the balance obviously advocated by the universal creative intelligence. All attempts by game players to replace the reality of individual-based sex-balance with group-oriented ideas or with "laws," enforced by group power, have been crude and bungling.

In India, the attempt was made to express the meaning of sex by artfully created gods representing life's balancing wills as abstracts. This, of course, perverted perception. Modern students of science, who pride themselves on ignoring "religious conditioning," have been led to focus objectively on the reproductive aspect of sex and to consider life by a formula that contains no perceptive will in its equation. They have accepted dogmas about sex that preclude an unbiased look at its meaning. Such dogmas are the raw stuff for making group-gods, and "science" can serve as a group-god, if it is used as such. As a serpent-making weapon for obscuring the significance of sex, currently practiced "sex education" is fully as destructive of perception as the older "sexual taboos."

The pressure of "the way things are" tends to crowd out those who are able to sluff off dogmas and listen to what the voice within themselves says of sex. It tends to crowd out those who take a sufficiently perceptive look at enduring reality to discover that sex is not an abstract characteristic of life — yet, neither is it merely a reproductive process. It tends to crowd out those who recognize that sex is inseparably integrated into each individual's being as part of that one individual's innate perception and that two sexes provide life with a perceivable long-range balance. Yet all unconditioned humans I have ever known have understood sex and understood each other. From what I see, all big conflicts in our world originate from serpent makers. The conflict between all serpents and all individuals is the one that here concerns us.

Although there can be no reasoned support for groupism, individualism, the other fork in the road, is no longer something to which we can point. With the formation of the German Reich, the way of the serpent had at last been fully accepted by the last holdout which might effectively have opposed the history-old serpent way in the broad arena of world affairs.

The Reich had been in existence less than fifty years when it was reduced to total chaos by World War I. In that chaos the beginnings of the ultimate battle to determine the direction of the human species could have been seen. But, because seventeen hundred years of brainwashing had been so effective, what was happening was not

clearly evident throughout the world. It is not publicly recognized yet. It cannot be seen as long as humans continue to think of themselves as "parts" of various semi-organisms—and never look at the human species as a whole. It cannot be seen as long as humans look only at unreal group-gods, who are jealous of other unreal group-gods.

— Or should I now change to a different language?

In an effort to aid clarity, it might be well to change the language used when referring to the Bible. As we have moved forward in history, some of the language we needed in the beginning has become inappropriate. Definitely, we now need to include acknowledged atheists as serpent makers, and it approaches the absurd to talk of atheists believing in, or advocating, group-gods. So it might be well to look again at the primary example of people advocating a group-god—the Jews.

Jesus made it clear that the group-god of the Jews was not the universal creative intelligence. Moses obviously recognized that many who had been in Egypt remembered all too well what "god" had caused the widespread deaths among the Egyptians. He had those killed who openly acknowledged the fictional character of the group-god he was presenting. Most Jews now acknowledge the fictional character of that god. According to Arthur Koestler, who, having Jewish heritage, has been able to explore the question extensively; the majority of present day Jews are atheists or agnostics. However, they remain a cohesive group, giving top priority to what is "good" for the Nomadic Jewish Nation with as complete a disregard for "outsiders" as if they were blindly following the lead of a jealous group-god. In this respect, they have led a trend in present day serpent making. Judaeo-Communism is openly atheistic. Most state-serpents give lip service to separation between state and religion, even though the Greeks long ago discovered that it cannot be done effectively. The Jews never tried it. From the beginning the Jews have always viewed religion as a political tool; from the beginning their god was a front for gaining the tolerance of deeply religious people. And down through the centuries their elaborate "religious" ceremonies have been mere rituals for reaffirming group unity. Now, predominately atheists or agnostics, they are clearly committed, not to a god but, to a voluntary grouping that aids Jews to the disregard of everyone outside their group. Looking at the Jews clarifies the total serpent picture.

Commitment to a nation-state, founded on a groupism pseudo-morality, functions in exactly the same way as commitment to a group-god. The state is viewed by present day people in exactly the

same way that more primitive people viewed a group-god. "Our state" and "we, who are god's chosen people" are the same sort of words saying "we are parts of a cohesive group and will act as a group."

In a world of many atheists, who think themselves too sophisticated for group-god beliefs, clarity requires us to update the wording of the laws Moses got the Jews to accept — in exactly the same way the communists got communism accepted in Russia — by killing off the opposition. To bring the laws of Moses into current thought patterns, they would need only be changed to read: "You shall love your state with all your soul, mind, and strength — for your own is a jealous state that will surely kill unbelievers."

State-serpent makers use a reshuffled version of the old Catholic sophistry to promote confusion and obscure what is happening. When the Pope had full control of the "Holy Roman Empire" all significant questions were called "religious" and therefore under the Pope's jurisdiction. To serpent makers significant questions are those where words effectively control human will. Now that civil serpents dominate, "religious freedom" is sometimes allowed — provided all significant actions willed by individuals are tied by words to state "authority" — and religions confine themselves to passive "faiths." Yet the simplest logic cries out that if individual integrity is advocated, separation between religion and individual will can be nothing but sophistry. It is now the states that promote the significant serpent-making pseudo-morality that the individual is merely a "part" and the unit having priority in willed action is the group. It is therefore the states that now promote the primitive group-god pseudo-morality and actively defy the manifest morality of the universal creative intelligence.

The present world condition may determine whether or not the human species gives up its place in the advance echelon of evolution. The question now becomes: Can there any longer be anything but state against state, serpent against serpent? Has the individual already lost every chance of survival as an individual?

THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The beginning focal point of the ultimate world conflict was in the chaos of Germany following the first World War. The factors were clearly apparent, but were not publicly identified. The publicly identified results of the First World War are these:

(1) In North America "German" became a hated word; it came to refer only to the German-speaking-people of the Reich, who had been our wartime enemy. Popular history in America was distorted

to obscure the fact that most Americans are of German heritage; popular history perpetuated the wartime viewpoint of the Germans as an "enemy" people.

(2) In Russia the war provided the chaos for which the Communists had spent fifty years preparing. They took full advantage of it, shot the existing rulers, tore down the altars of other group-gods, and gave the old commandment an up to date expression: "You shall love Communism with all your soul, mind, and strength, for Communism is the one and only true way, and the name of Communism is jealous."

(3) The conditions imposed on the Reich, by the United States and others who defeated the "Germans," resulted in a chaos from which would come the still bigger World War II — still another conflict between states jealous of other states.

In America the Second World War is remembered for the single fact that Hitler ordered the killing of about six million Jews, who were not in uniform and were not carrying the arms and flag of an enemy state. This fact needs to be put in perspective if the total reality — of what was and is happening to the whole human species — is to be seen. War, as a gentlemen's sporting event, existed only in some areas of the world, and that kind of war existed only for a short time in world history. Before, during, and after the mass killings that were contrary to the "gentlemen's" war, there were similar and even more atrocious things done by others, including the Jews, themselves, as recited in their Bible. But that does not make the knowledge that six million people were gassed and their corpses burned less awe inspiring. Hitler's avowed objective of keeping impure blood from polluting pure blood was ridiculous, but to dismiss Hitler and the whole German people as more insane than the rest of the human species is to refuse to look at realities. The whole human species is in this thing together. What happened in Germany needs to be seen from a perspective embracing all humanity.

What happened in Germany needs to be seen, not as a conflict of Germans and Jews, but as a conflict of one group-semi-organism with another group-semi-organism. Germans versus Jews was a word-created division of humans — just as Marx's "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" was a word-created division of humans. But this condition cannot be brushed aside with the statement "let's just all love each other." That admonition ignores a significance that reality will not ignore. Reality presents every individual human with a command that cannot be escaped: "Choose! Do you commit to individual sovereignty? Or do you commit to group sovereignty over

the individual?"

How many similar examples must be looked at before that choice can be seen as the only one there is?

If we use serpent-language and speak of a nation as having an enemy, if we use serpent-language and speak of the German Reich as if it were a real thing, if we speak of it as a "nation," about fifty years old, then, unquestionably, the Nomadic Jewish Nation, about three thousand years old, was Germany's major enemy. It was an enemy on three counts:

(1) The flip side of the coin, which the Catholic Church had tried to pass off as Christianity, was fashioned from the Jewish Bible.

(2) The ideology and objectives of the Communists, standing armed at the German borders, were Jewish: Communism was evolved from Jewish traditions and advocated the Jewish pseudo-morality.

(3) The flesh and blood people, who were committed to the Nomadic Jewish Nation while living in Germany, were actively and effectively gaining word-control over the native Germans. They were using the underhanded methods celebrated in the Passover Feast, as further developed by more than two thousand years of living in a parasitic relationship with various host nations. Seventy-eight percent of the lawyers in Austria were Jews. The Jewish House of Ullstein was the biggest publisher of books and periodicals in Germany; this Jewish family dominated the media.

Using serpent-language, no people ever had a more clearly defined enemy than the German people had in the Jewish people.

But this is not the usual sort of history about peoples against peoples, nations against nations, serpents against serpents. It is not focusing on fictitious entities. This is a history of word-controlled humans — and the realities are human individuals.

We first looked at the Jews, who built their serpent in secret. Now we look at the Germans. They operated in the open and can be clearly seen. Also the events are recent enough for all details to be known.

Never on earth has there been a more spectacular and impressive assembly of highly disciplined, and tightly regimented, human individuals than those who responded to the word control of Adolf Hitler. The speaker stood and addressed the assembly. The speaker's words, and the heils that came from the armed men, stirred memories of sovereigns beating swords against their shields in the Saxon forests. In the Saxon forests the sound had been both applause and commitment to a leader who dared a noble fight and asked for brave men to join him. The cherished memory was

magnified to unspeakable grandeur by the staged spectacle; the response of brave men was the response to a vague subconscious memory.

In that assembly, an innate knowledge, once consciously articulated, but now confused by a thousand years of word-control, stirred as a vague impulsive response to a leader asking men to remember something that had long been buried in the deepest depths of their beings. The deflection of a valid impulse is the point that needs attention.

The Jews had originally been word controlled under the laws of leaders who set themselves up as gods knowing a good and evil different from that manifest by the universal creative intelligence. The Jews had been word controlled for three thousand years; the Germans for much less time — they still had an impulse to revolt against the serpent. The way of the serpent is immoral. The impulse was valid. Bringing the language of the two peoples together, the serpent had come into the Saxon forest, and the Germans had not originally recognized the Jewish serpent as the dragon, which German tradition warned against. Now — half consciously — they did.

But Hitler was no Siegfried fighting a dragon; he was a dragon maker as surely as Moses was a serpent maker.

Dragon, serpent, state, nation, reich, fatherland, body politic — all are words for something that as yet has no reality among humans. However these fictitious things can become realities. The possibility is a real and present danger for the entire human species. This same evolutionary regression has been "accomplished" by ants and certain species of bees. It is the danger ancient German mythology warned against.

If Hitler had shown himself to be the Siegfried that he apparently visualized himself to be, then the "Heil Hitler" of brave men in uniformed columns would have been taken up by brave men throughout the world. Since Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, and the mythological American cowboy became a twenty-one inch shadow, no clear eyed leader has stood up among sovereign individuals and voiced the objective for which brave men — who remain discrete individuals — still stand ready to fight.

What would Hitler have said if he had been such a clear eyed leader? What would he have said if he had not been a demagog, trying to promote the same idea of a chosen people that three thousand years before had been promoted by those he now called enemy?

He would have proclaimed the eternal truth, which was silenced

by mass murder, individual torture, and priestly inquisitions in the Saxon forests. He would have proclaimed the eternal truth voiced by Jesus, Roger Williams, and Thomas Jefferson. The time was ripe. The stage was set. And he was speaking to the people who had held out longest for individual freedom. A Hitler with the soul of a Siegfried might have said:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all humans are created sovereign individuals, that every individual has all the rights and powers that the word-perverters of reality have said belong to a group-god or to a 'sovereign state.' We, who support these truths, now face a conflict with those who seek to pervert them.

"Two thousand years ago the armies of Julius Caesar tried to press the sovereignty of a man-created "authority" on the German people — a people fully aware that we inherited our own creative intelligence, as discrete human beings, from the aboriginal creative intelligence of the universe. We refused to recognize any man-created "authority." We effectively resisted the armies of Caesar. As free sovereign individuals, voluntarily committing ourselves temporarily to the strategic planning of the most able leaders in our midst, we fought and retained our individual freedom — the freedom which the dragon sought to take from us. We have always retained that freedom, always, since unrecorded times when memories dissolve into mythology.

"We defeated the armies of Caesar. But then came the priests. They were kindly old men, who told us of Jesus. They said that Jesus had tried to tell others what we have always accepted as axiomatic. They quoted Jesus as saying, 'You can disobey the gods people create and that may cause trouble, however gods made by men are something you can safely transgress against; but if you disobey the holy spirit within you, you are in danger of eternal damnation.' The priests told us that Jesus was crucified by his own people, the Jews, for telling them this obvious truth, and that Jesus had died as a brave man should. We recognized that Jesus was more than a hero; we recognized that he was a god — he was expressing with his total being what we considered to be the one significant truth on which human salvation depends. We allowed the priests to tell the story of Jesus to our children.

"But the priests were underhanded schemers. When we were not there, they told our children about the miraculous ways of the outside world. Like pimps, making use of beautiful young women, they set up Catholic schools, and charmed the children into believing that 'authoritative' words should overrule native perception —

perception both of the inner voice and perception of external reality. Too late we discovered that it was not Jesus, but the very group-god of the Jews who had crucified Jesus, for whom our children were being taught reverence.

"Those children, conditioned by false words, grew up to become brainwashed leaders of brainwashed followers. On instructions from the Pope, they obeyed exactly the same orders given to the sons of Levi by Moses, when he said: 'Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor.' They killed individuals who would not accept 'authority' expressed in words. As soon as the priests had the protection of brainwashed men, they devised unbelievable tortures for all who obeyed the spirit within themselves.

"We have now had a thousand years of confusion, caused by those priests. We still have the slyly injected words of this Jewish group-god permeating our thoughts. The confusion has become a part of our literature. It will be generations before we can return to natural relations between individuals, and to natural relations between each individual and the creative intelligence of the universe. That is our own problem; that is the problem of Germans, who have been duped. We know what has to be done. It is up to us to remove the obstruction from our own eyes.

"However there are two further problems.

"The problem of next closest intimacy exists because we have allowed the Jews, themselves, to live among us, while they were still committed to a direction opposing ours. Now we all speak the same language, we have many of the same customs, and we have inter-married to such an extent that biological heritage cannot be distinguished by appearance in a high proportion of individuals. The problem exists because the great majority of those who have any faint trace of Jewish heritage commit themselves to Jewish traditions, and to the direction implicit in those traditions.

"While living among us, the Jews have acted cohesively, in accordance with the traditions and direction they perpetuate among themselves. Most of them have shown by their acts that their first allegiance is to the Nomadic Jewish Nation, that they are presenting a false front as citizens of the German Reich. This is not a passive cohesiveness.

"The majority of lawyers in Austria are Jews. The Jews substantially control the media in Germany. Grain by grain they insert their own ideas in small doses, which they can "legally" defend. The total underhanded activity gradually weights the ideology of

books in libraries and schools toward Jewish pseudo-morality. Jewish pseudo-morality diametrically opposes the morality of the Germans.

"Jewish traditions promote the pseudo-morality that the welfare of the Jews as a group is the only valid objective. They teach that individuals within the group have value only to the extent that they contribute to the group's welfare. They set forth no concept of sex but for the purpose of reproduction, for formation of ties that promote Jewish traditions, and for sensual "lust." They ignore the very reality of the sexual love that recognizes — and glories in — the wonder of the sexual balance devised by the universal creative intelligence.

"We, Germans, see individual humans — with sex as a balance between two essential creative functions — as the advance echelon of evolution and the direction pointed by the universal creative intelligence. We, therefore, recognize that the traditions, the pseudo-morality, and the direction of the Jews are totally unreconcilable with the traditions, morality, and direction of the Germans.

"The universal creative intelligence obviously tolerates regression, all the way back to asexuality, in ants and bees. But those who regress become a separate species. As of now there is no separate species among humans, resulting from group pseudo-morality; but the direction is clear. Jews and Germans cannot exist together while pursuing opposite directions.

"The Jews among us, who want to abandon the Jewish serpent and make an unequivocal commitment to individualism, are welcome to remain. Those who want to continue in the Jewish direction must leave. If they stay without a formal commitment — without a formal commitment ratified by subsequent behavior — they will be considered as spies and saboteurs, holding citizenship in an enemy nation, while living under a false front as citizens of the Reich. They will be executed.

"We have a third problem, which makes it too precarious for us to tolerate known saboteurs in our midst. Now we must fight Judaeo-Communism for our very survival. An enemy — born of Jewish tradition — now stands fully armed at our Russian border. The Jewish pseudo-morality of making the individual nothing, and the 'good' of the group the only objective, is clearly manifest in Communism. In the Soviet Union, this Judaeo-Communism has replaced Judaeo-Catholicism, as the opiate of the masses; it is based on the same practice of placing words above reality. Communism is the Jewish serpent turned into the Judaeo-Communist dragon. The ways of the serpent have often been too underhanded

for immediate recognition — but the dragon we recognize and know how to fight.

"We fight a war on three fronts. We fight on three fronts against those who call individual sovereignty immoral. On two of these three fronts we must fight alone. On the third front — where the enemy is clearly visible — we now face the Jewish serpent become the Communist dragon. Judaeo-Communism has a clear objective of total world control. We appeal to all who have sufficiently overcome the pseudo-morality that has mutilated our German heritage, and has confused the teachings of Jesus for two thousand years, to join us. The future direction of the human species hangs on the outcome of the war for which battle lines are now forming on Germany's eastern front."

If Hitler had used his oratorical skill to put such opposition to group semi-organisms — Jewish and otherwise — into the kind of words that the occasion called for, he might have found individuals in great numbers everywhere ready to fight against groups trying to destroy them. But the sincerity that gives power to oratory would have required a different man. Hitler was not a Siegfried.

However, Hitler was sincere. It was the sincere voice of a confident leader, ready to fight and die for what he believed, that stirred memories of that long ago Saxon forest.

The memories of that almost forgotten Saxon forest still cry out for the attention of waking consciousness. Those memories cry out that we need to recognize, with our full consciousness, what was wrong with the situation signified by the life and death of Hitler. That conscious recognition is of vital importance to the future of the whole human species.

In the forest, where individual sovereignty held sway, there had been two equal sexes. The male's will, to create by selective destruction, had been evenly balanced by the female's will, to create by selecting what she willed to preserve and cherish. In the Saxon forest each man, who saw himself as a sovereign individual, also saw himself balanced by a woman equally sovereign. In all significant matters he consulted her as an equal. Two thousand years ago, impressed observers from other areas did not say "as an equal" but "as a goddess." The observation was a valid one. Reverence for the sexual balance, designed by the universal creative intelligence, was basic to the concept of individual sovereignty. This reverence for woman — as that portion of the voice of the universal creative intelligence which was only a faint whisper in the depths of man's being — this reverence was a consciously accepted control over masculine aggressiveness.

Only one side of the richly remembered past in the forest had been so magnified as to present the highly disciplined men of the German Reich in awe inspiring grandeur.

When Hitler rose as their leader to address the most spectacular group of fighting men ever assembled on earth, Eva Braun — in an apartment, deliberately obscured from public view by the Fuhrer — was attempting suicide; she was attempting suicide because she was alone and ashamed of her very existence — an existence that had been deprived of all purpose in the grand spectacle around her.

When Hitler rose to point out the Jews as the world's greatest enemy, his battle cry was not: We must regain and preserve the individual sovereignty lost to us when clever priests, passing off Jewish group-making commandments as the teachings of Jesus, infiltrated the Saxon forests. Hitler was a brainwashed product of the very thing he professed to be fighting. He was raised a Catholic; he was enormously impressed by the serpent ceremonies of the Catholic Church; he seriously considered becoming a Catholic priest; the swastika was adopted from an engraving on the gate of a Catholic monastery that, as a child, he passed every day. He was committed to the flip side of the Catholic coin — the group serpent advocated by the Jews.

Although his biological roots went back to the forests where the teachings of Jesus were accepted as axiomatic, Hitler was the opposite of Jesus. If he had been a Jew, he could have been cheered by the Jews as the sort of messiah for which — after crucifying Jesus — they still waited. He had been brainwashed into accepting Jewish traditions. Like Moses, he was holding up a serpent; he was saying that all who are bitten by other serpents, and fail to look on this one, shall surely die. Like Moses he cried out: We are a people chosen to dominate the rest of the world because of the ancestral blood in our veins.

There is no record of a voice by the River Rhine saying: Repent those words and be baptized into the human species. The admonition of Jesus to first remove the obstruction from one's own eye, before trying to treat a brother, was rejected by Hitler, as it was by the Jews. It conflicts with the craft of serpent makers.

The second World War was groups fighting groups. Jesus, or a ghost from the ancient Saxon forests, or anyone else advocating individual freedom, would have been a voice crying in the wilderness of rattling drums and marching feet. Such an advocate of individualism might have been crucified by a patriotic mob. Certainly such a one would have been sneered at, and spit upon — by allies and enemies alike — because he was "unpatriotic." That is the

significant thing that had happened to the whole human species. No longer did any people, great enough to carry weight in the world arena, uphold the morality of individualism. The way of the serpent had finally come to dominate the entire world.

The Germans fenced the Jews in concentration camps and the Americans fenced the Japanese in concentration camps. When the war was being lost, the Germans killed the captive Jews. When the "patriotic" mob hysteria quieted after the war, the Americans released the Japanese.

In a bunker, Hitler and Eva Braun committed suicide together. The Romeo-Juliet situation is overshadowed by a fitting epitaph that comes to mind, as Hitler might have spoken it. With truth and sincerity, he could have said: I have been a poor caricature of a man, and I have been a worse lover, but, to the very end, I have been a patriot.

Had he made such a statement, he would doubtless have been proud of the self-appraisal. And no one could disagree with it. It would be difficult to find a more selfless, single-minded patriot than Adolf Hitler. Of such is the kingdom of serpents.

THE PRESENT WORLD CONDITION

Whether a serpent is made up of Germans or Jews, whether it is called "civil" or "religious," whether it is manipulated by a conspicuous dictator or an entrenched bureaucracy is not the problem. The whole human species is now in one common snake pit. The way of the serpent can lead only to extinction of the human species, or — what to me appears far worse — human regression. The problem is: How can individual integrity be restored?

We have talked of the spread of the history-old way of the serpent everywhere except in the Far East. There it has been slightly different.

The Japanese — like the German tribes before Catholic "Christianity" — originally saw the universal creative intelligence, expressed in nature, as being "the word of god;" they found "tongues in trees, books in running brooks, sermons in stone, and good in everything." Unlike the concepts of the early German tribes, that were blotted from history by priests, patient monks twisting "mythology," and the tortures of the inquisitions — Shinto, the religion of the Japanese, has survived. In it can be seen the essence of all religions, such as true Christianity, that are based upon and refer to observations of nature. Those who study nature can only conclude that all living things are direct descendants of the aboriginal creative intelligence; and that thoughtful humans are

distinguished from other living things only because more fully conscious, and because they have a language — which they misuse.

Shinto was subtly perverted with words because the Japanese Emperor wanted "authority." To give him "authority" the perception recited in Shinto was slightly deflected from its original concept — the concept that every living thing is a discrete descendant of god. It was modified to state the partial concept that "the Emperor is a descendant of god." By failing to mention all others, it implied that the divine heritage belonged exclusively to the emperor. The corollary to the implication was that others should obey his words.

Just where the Japanese will fit into World War III, now shaping up, is not easy to guess at this time. The exact direction of the Chinese is even harder to predict.

The Chinese have been close enough to the soil to let family evolve into serpent, or dragon, only within the area occupied by the Chinese people. Genghis Khan almost overran all Europe but, on the whole, the Chinese have not, in the past, aimed at universality. Now they have adopted Communism as their word-control system, and adopted the Marxist objective that communism must become the only international power. However Judaeo-Communism may undergo some modification in China. This is because the Chinese were not previously word controlled by Catholic Judaeo—"Christianity," as were the Russians.

Islam dominates the mideast and all of Africa. Mexico and South America continue Catholic.

The serpents or dragons of the world are now moving toward an all-out, world-wide contest. Total atomic war that destroys most of the people in the world appears almost inevitable. Whether it comes or not, the same question faces the human species — those now living or any few who survive. The question is this: Will there continue to be nothing but group-semi-organisms, which can only result in ultimate human regression, a regression that removes humans from the advance echelon of evolution? Or will we humans recover from our brainwashing and choose the way that has been pointed by the universal creative intelligence for three billion years — individual sovereignty?

Where do we look for an answer? The way of the serpent had enslaved most of the human species even before the dawn of history. Now it enslaves all.

Where do we look for a power that is both capable of controlling serpents and has the will to do so? Even if such an organization as the United Nations ever developed the capability, such an organiza-

tion, taking its power from serpents, would not have the motive for, gradually but relentlessly, reducing the serpents' word-control of individuals.

Does this mean that no answer but one of the two that are unacceptable is possible? It does unless individuals assert their innate sovereignty; the will to control serpents must come from individuals.

Can such a diametrical reversal of present conditions be accomplished? The United States and other areas where people still have a vague memory of individual sovereignty appears the best possibility for consciously moving away from serpent practices.

Can it be joint action between members of such organization as NATO? No.

If there is to be any accomplishment, it must begin with the individual "parts" of one serpent. In the United States it must begin with removal of the big obstructions from our own eyes so that we can see clearly to remove the small obstructions from the eyes of others. Bumbling attempts to improve the visions of others results in mass warfare. Certainly, we, the people of the United States, have need for self-treatment. The virtue of United States power lies in the fact that such self-treatment could be made conspicuous enough to furnish the whole world with an example of what can be accomplished.

FIRST REMOVE THE OBSTRUCTION FROM OUR OWN EYES

Stealth — underhanded methods — is the way of the United States semi-organism that is most objectionable, both to conscientious individuals that it calls its "parts," and to others looking from distant shores at the United States as a serpent-entity. The ways celebrated in the Passover Feast have permeated United States politics, just as the Judaeo—"Christianity," and all it implies, has permeated United States language, literature, and thought. The undercover "authority" that needs to be removed before we can have clear vision is exercised in the United States through two methods:

(1) Laws are made in such profusion that clear law does not exist. "Authority" is arbitrarily exercised by serpent-making persons in "positions of authority." The "authority" of the positions exists "by the grace of the positions" as in earlier times "authority" in a monarch existed "by the grace of a group-god." The fact that there are many such positions, whose incumbents compete with each other, simply turns law into a garbage heap from which

"government aid" and "government penalty" come about in underhanded maneuvers — underhanded maneuvers by, and in conspiracy with, individuals in "authoritative" positions. This condition makes underhanded dealings the most expedient, if not the only, method of accomplishing anything — good or bad. The fact that the practice is fully accepted makes those who respect and adhere to the facade of written law totally ineffectual. They are seen as naive fools, and looked upon with snickering contempt by those who "know how to get things done."

(2) Money, as "authority," is used to obtain control of "positions of authority" and to make "laws" favorable to undercover operations. The practice of collecting United States taxes and using them in unconstitutional ways, by conspiracy with persons and bureaucracies having "authority," is on such a scale that it leaves the perception of "citizens" completely numbed. Outside observers, distant enough not to be numbed, are fully aware that the United States is constantly using money taken from United States tax payers to finance surreptitious political activities in foreign countries. The practice has made the United States, which was once looked upon as the champion of individuals, the most suspiciously surreptitious serpent now in "existence." It could become the most hated.

Open, aboveboard, clearly defined action, with a clearly stated constitutional purpose, is the conspicuous treatment needed.

IS THIS CONSPICUOUS TREATMENT POSSIBLE?

Despite the United States' faults recited above, individuals living under the struggle for "authority" in the United States system probably still have more freedom than individuals anywhere else in the world. The Bill of Rights for individuals is being slowly destroyed because it is being misused by groups trying to get special group privileges. But the Bill of Rights remains the one facet of law to which individuals can appeal for protection against the surreptitious acts of "authorities" now controlling the United States. Also the scarred and mutilated first amendment still stands and still says: "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of people peacefully to assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances." The opportunity still exists for the people of the United States to turn the tide of world history in favor of individual sovereignty.

Voting will NOT accomplish this. The entrenched politicians, and others just like them, which are all the existing system puts into office, will never do what is necessary if allowed to continue in the

same pattern. Still, as of this moment — without armed revolution — those in "positions of authority" could be required to obey a clear and positive mandate from the people.

The possibility of defeating the way of the serpent by peaceful means and restoring individual sovereignty to the people of the United States — and maybe, thereby, to all the peoples of the world — depends on the answer to two questions:

(1) Are there enough Christians among the Judaeo- "Christians," and enough others committed to individual sovereignty, to present the necessary mandate to those in "positions of authority?"

(2) If those mentioned above do exist can they be aroused to present such a mandate before World War III closes the gate on this moment of opportunity?

INDIVIDUALS CAN ACT

Words — that are accepted as law — have been used to control and enslave all individuals. Words — that are accepted as law — can also be used to break that control and enslavement.

It is important not to make it easy for serpent advocates to divide individuals and defeat our actions — because we are individuals. Therefore I want to end this work by quoting from Melvin Gorham's current book, *The Six Disciplines of Man's Being and Man's Relation to Government*:

The following five steps are legally available to all who are designated "citizens of the United States." If action — other than bloody revolution — is going to depose the ruling bureaucratic monster of the United States, these steps must be taken with unwavering deliberation that refuses to be deflected into a babble of words that are not law.

I

The first step is for people of good will to use some of the energy and money that in the past has gone into the circus contests between tweedle-dee-tweedle-dum political candidates to concentrate public attention on the following indisputable facts:

1. The laws made and enforced by the elected, appointed, and hired employees of the United States have

become so numerous and complex that countless thousands of individuals in the government can make arbitrary decisions that may or may not be legal but are too much trouble to contest.

2. The economy and the value of money are being destroyed by this confusion.

3. The borderline between criminal and legal actions is breaking down until expedient action in the cloud of confusion is becoming the general practice. As a result there is a fading away of all semblance of government by law. The cry for law and order is a cry of those drowning in so many laws that there can be no law and order.

4. The power taken from the states, counties, and cities by the Federal Government in a quasi-legal manner has further increased the confusion. In contested relationships between bodies politic, flesh and blood individuals receive no attention.

5. The U.S. Government that was set up to guard against tyranny has itself created a bureaucratic tyranny of individual-fettering confusion.

6. The obvious remedy is a new, updated clarity of concept as to the functions of the U.S. Government, followed by a severe limitation on bureaucratic rules that have the status of Federal Law.

II

The second step is to focus intelligent discussion, with an intensity that refuses to be deflected, on the further indisputable fact that, short of revolution, there is one way and one way only to correct the existent state of confusion. Congress must act. The first effective act to implement the obvious remedy is entirely and exclusively within the powers of Congress. The following two steps in one action by Congress taken in the order given will be effective. Anything less than this complete action will increase the problem of government-by-confusion.

First step to be taken by Congress

Remove every Federal agency other than those that would be part of a clarified Federal Government, as set forth in Congress's second step below, from a position where their regulations have the status of Federal Law. Change them into Government corporations that can sue and be sued — but whose regulations are not laws that bog down legislation and law enforcement. (An example of this procedure exists in the evolution of the Federal National Mortgage Association - FNMA. When this and similar acts of legislation are buried within the continually expanding bureaucracy, they give no aid, whatsoever, to the present objective. The example is cited only to show that the procedure is workable. Congress already knows how to use it.) This first step is necessarily first because the numerous Federal agencies, the obscure and ambiguously facaded Federal agencies, by their very status as parts of the Federal Government, create a confusion that makes any approach to the second step hopelessly complicated and therefore impossible. This first step can be totally accomplished with one vote on one bill. Anything else can only be construed as an attempt to create confusion.

Second step to be taken by Congress

Prepare and submit for ratification an updated and clarified constitution that limits the Federal Government's parts, whose regulations are law, to those of (a) national defense, (b) regulatory control of subordinate bodies politic, and (c) protection of individuals from the United States, itself, and from subordinate bodies politic in fields clearly specified and effectively implemented by that same constitution.

III

Only Congress as a unified body can accomplish this action. Yet no one can be naive enough not to know that Congress will resist taking the above action. This is true because this action would remove much of the power of individual politicians and competing political parties to do surreptitious favors for constituents in exchange for support. Therefore, after the public is aware of exactly what is needed, the pressure of the people demanding this action as top priority must be exerted on Congress. Every legal means possible should be used for this purpose by every person who is conscious or can be made conscious of the pressing necessity.

This pressure on Congress is necessary, not because congressmen are some special breed of unscrupulous scoundrels but, because long ago the practice of tying trivial laws to the constitution by thin legal ramifications caused the system to degenerate into one of "pork barrel politics". Every Congressional effort to correct the system became another tenuously tied law that further complicated the mess. Congressmen know that they cannot really "clean house" unless their actions have full support from the people. The people have never given Congress a mandate to "clean up the mess". If there is to be real change that mandate must be given.

IV

After the action to frame a new constitution gets under way the people will need to pressure Congress into incorporating a new factor into the new constitution that politicians will be reluctant to include. Again the mandate must be given. This new factor also will put a drastic limitation on powers now zealously guarded by elected legislators. This requirement is that one body politic must have only one body of law — always completely contained in one document.

Despite the fact that this condition has not existed since the early days of the republic, and the argument will, of course, be made that things are now too complicated for such practice, such an argument cannot be accepted. Law to be workable must be brief enough to be fully reproduced, widely distributed, held in his hands, read, understood, and used to defend himself or protect his interests by any individual over whom it claims jurisdiction. There can be no government by law, and consequently no law-abiding citizens, unless the law is clearly stated. To satisfy the condition of clarity there must be a completely self-contained document which, resisting all bureaucratic expediency, can be held in his hand by a natural person and recognized indisputably as THE LAW.

This principle incorporated into the Federal Constitution will not only limit the Federal Government, it will serve two other essential purposes. First, it will limit all state and subordinate governments. Second, it will set a precedent among the governments of the world on which "recognition" of one government by another can be based. Therefore the new Federal Constitution should contain words that carry the following intent:

"The body politic known as the United States of America invites acceptance by the powers of the world on the basis of this comprehensive statement of its laws, and hereby declares that it will consider recognition of another body politic only if such body politic publishes a single document which it asserts to be the sole and total expression of its intents and purposes, and of its mechanics for bringing conforming pressures on all it proposes to govern. This must include all natural individuals and all fictitious entities subordinate to itself, all things or persons, real or fictitious, which it claims as its component parts. This one document must be offered to the world at large and to the governed as having supremacy over all others."

After the first four steps have been taken several options would open, all leading away from the primitive thought pattern which has been rigidly formalized into the dogma that every individual on earth must identify with a body politic.

The first tangible evidence of changing thought patterns would probably result from the following event. The United States Government's severe limitation of its own powers would make it a sought-after protector by all small nations of the world. Presumably the protection would be extended to those who published acceptable constitutions. When the blanket of protection began to spread, the need for an individual to identify with a protected nation would be no greater than the present need for one designated a U.S. Citizen to identify with a state, county, or city government.

Increasing freedom of immigration between areas under jurisdiction of recognized governments would need to follow so that individuals could demonstrate preference by moving to a new area instead of fighting to impose their own preference upon people in some other area.

There can never be a world of free people choosing their own laws as long as any minority, even a minority of one, has no choice except a choice between the tyrannies of already established majorities. Therefore areas where no government had jurisdiction and none was allowed to take jurisdiction would need to be allowed in order to provide a full range of choices. Extensive areas of public land over which the U.S. and the separate states now claim jurisdiction would need to be set aside for this purpose, as well as other areas throughout the world.

With the above highly probable results, new concepts and a language in which they could be expressed would have the opportunity to evolve. These would be concepts and language for moving completely away from the

primitive thought pattern of tribal or peer group identification (formalized as being parts of a "body politic") —and moving toward concepts and language for mature sovereign individuals making agreements with each other for self-government.

Thereafter the future is difficult to see. It is not difficult to see because the crystal ball becomes cloudy; it is difficult to see because the glory of the possibilities is too dazzling to contemplate. From the present perspective the direction which biological evolution would begin to move seems almost unbelievable. But it is unbelievable only because of a widespread myth that, throughout all history, has been part of everyone's earliest childhood programming. This myth claims that man is, in the inherent nature that he shares with other animals, essentially evil—and man, being evil, must be governed. This myth exists and is perpetuated because it is the brainwashing basis on which to write its corollary: Everyone who is not an "evil outlaw" must identify with a body politic.

No perceptive person, especially among those who have had any contact with wild or domestic animals other than man, can of his own observation believe this myth that walls in the superhighway. But no one can point to evidence that it is not true. They cannot point to evidence that it is not true because, in a world where all must identify with a body politic or perish, and their history be distorted or wiped out, there simply can not be any empirical evidence to disprove the myth.

In a world that accepts only what is borne out by empirical evidence, it is useless to argue against the evidence when one knows that the evidence has been rigged. But open the field of evidence and look at what kind of morality can be observed in animals other than man. Do they not all seem to live under the concept that conscious, prideful, individual sovereignty is the highest morality? Now assume a culture of *Homo sapiens* where this morality, consciously voiced, was allowed to replace the present childhood brainwashing and myth implantation. Would not the psychotic outlaw—the lawless,

pridefully immoral anarchist reacting to a body politic, the psychotic outlaw that is so familiar throughout all recorded history—would he not be bred out of existence if he had no body politic against which to react, if instead, he had to come up against men of good will who proudly defended their individual sovereignty?

Admittedly there is no evidence in written history of such a condition but with the reality that is spread out before us—the non-human as well as the human reality—must it not be in order to ask this further question? —Could the human species that we love and cherish have developed if—somewhere in the two million years of unknown history which predates the fifteen thousand years that is known—the above hypothesized evolutionary selection had not been the manifest pattern of the triumphant reality?

It must be recognized that step V cannot be seriously approached at this time. The working out of its details will have to come after passing over the off-ramp for world transition from the rigidly formalized primitive thought patterns to those that do not yet have a language for their communication. The thought patterns have no language but they exist now within man and can be brought into waking consciousness by all who allow their thoughts to escape from their childhood brainwashing. All who now have clear vision can see that there will be an opening for step V when the first four steps have been taken.

But the first four steps, opening the exit to the off-ramp have not yet been taken, and if we now dwell on step V our opportunity to act may slip by while we stand talking. We live in a world of reality. We are dealing with force and deflecting force requires action. The stampede is gathering momentum. Deflecting it is getting a few words set down as law. The necessary words are known. The opportunity is open at this moment; it may never be again. The time for action is now.

REFERENCES

Beowulf, Penguin Books, Inc. New York, N.Y.

Caesar, Gaius Julius. Caesar's commentaries on Gallic War. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. Carrighar, Sally.

Moonlight at Midday. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, N.Y. Daniel-Rops, Henry. Jesus and His Times. E.P. Dutton, New York, N.Y. Frenchen, Peter. Book of the Eskimos. Bramhall House, New York, N.Y. Gorham, Melvin. The Curse of the Ring. Sovereign Press, Rochester, WA. Gorham, Melvin. The Ring Cycle. Sovereign Press, Rochester

WA. Gorham, Melvin. The Six Disciplines of Man's Being and Man's Relation to Government. Sovereign Press, Rochester, WA.

Hamilton, Edith. The Greek Way. W.W. Norton & Co., New York, N.Y. Harland, John. Brave New World, A Different Projection.

Sovereign Press, Rochester, WA. Holy Bible. King James Version. World Publishing Co. New York, N.Y. Koestler, Arthur. Trail of the Dinosaur. MacMillan Publishing Co. New York, N.Y. Koran. E.P. Dutton, New York, N.Y.

Kraeling, Emnil G. Randy McNally Bible Atlas. Rand McNally & Co. New York, N.Y. Miller, Madeleine S. and J. Lane, Harper's Encyclopedia of Bible Life. Harper & Row, New York, N.Y. Nibelungenlied. E.P. Dutton & Co. New York, N.Y. Pedersen, Marguerite. Censorship in the U.S. — I Accuse the Jews. Sovereign Press. Rochester, WA. Plutarch. Parallel Lives. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. Renfrew, Colin. Ancient Europe is Older than We Thought.

National Geographic. November 1977. Tacitus. Complete Works of Tacitus. Modern Library, Inc.

Westminster, MD. Tocqueville, Alexis de. Democracy in America. New American Library, New York, N.Y. Wagner, Richard. Ring of the Nibelung. E.P. Dutton & Co. New York, N.Y.